

COMPARATIVE GRAMMAR

OF THE

SANSKRIT, /IND

GREEK, LATIN LITHUANIAN, GOTHIC GERMAN

AND SLAVONIC LANGUAGES

BY

PROFESSOR J BOPP

TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN

BY

EDWARD B EASTWICK FRS FSA, MRAS

FME T L NYORD M M R PTH A S TE IST PP I AND
E M AY P T E ERMA RIF T L ISTY A D PTIE GULOLO I L
CIETY LO D H NOR M M PTHE MA RA L PR BY
OC TY PR PE R P R TA LA CAO A D ANI IN
TIE T IND IL E, IAIL DIR AN TRA AT R P
TH TASHY NAMA TH I I I SA JAN THEIR M
R THER — B HAN THE GOLI TÁ TIE
A AN I SUHAI ETC E R

VOL III

SECOND EDITION

WILLIAMS AND NORGATE

LONDON, 14, HENRIETTA STREET, COVENT GARDEN, AND

EDINBURGH 20, SOUTH FREDERICK STREET

PARIS B DUPRAT

LEIPZIG F A BROCKHAUS

1856

LONDON

WILLIAM WATTS, CROWN COURT TEMPLE BAR

VERBS

[G Rd p 981]

FORMATION OF MOODS

POTENTIAL OPTATIVE AND SUBJUNCTIVE

716 IN the dialect of the Vedas the *Lét* mood or subjunctive is also formed by the insertion of an *a* in cases where in the corresponding indicative form an *a* is wanting by the lengthening of which the mood in question might be formed. Thus from the norist *abhāt* he was comes the subjunctive *bhūat* he may* be where by the augment being dropped the meaning of past time is also removed as is likewise the case in the potential and imperative from *akar* he made (for *akart* according to § 91)† comes *karat* 'he may make' from *chikēt* he recognises (R kit Cl 3) *chikēlat* he may recognise. So in Old Persian *ahatuy* he may be from *astuy* he is (Behist IV 38 &c) since the Sanskrit *ṣ* is retained in Old Persian before *t* but before vowels becomes *h*. From the norists also in the Vedic dialect come subjunctive moods with the terminations of the present hence *karat* he may make (Rig V 16 6) from *akar*. The Vedic dialect even forms the subjunctive mood by the simple

* The *Lét* mood has (see Wilson's *Slr Gr* p 463) sometimes a potential sometimes an imperative and sometimes a conditional meaning. I hesitated therefore at first how to render the German *er sei* (prop. if he be) here. But as both Bopp and Lassen declare the *Lét* to be identical with the Greek subjunctive, I have translated accordingly—*Translator*

† Aorist of the fifth formation which in the Vedic dialect is more extensively used than in classical Sanskrit

annunciation of the personal terminations of the present to the base of the aorist, thus *e.g.* *vyavôchat* (*vi* prep.), "he may announce," from *vyavôchat* (Rig V. CV. 4).

IMPERATIVE.

717. This mood, which, in classical Sanskrit, is formed only from the present indicative, is distinguished from the latter merely by the personal terminations (the first person of the three numbers excepted see § 713), which have been already discussed. The dual and plural, with the exception of the third person plural, have the secondary terminations, so that, *e.g.*, *bharatām*, "let the two carry,"

[G Ed p 982] is distinguished from *abharatām*, "the two carried," only by the omission of the augment. In Greek the difference of the termination *των* of *φέρέτων*, from *την* of the imperfect *ἔφερέτην*, is inorganic, as *των* and *την* are originally one, and both are based on the Sanskrit *tām*.

718. The second person singular of the Sanskrit first principal conjugation—i.e. that which corresponds to the Greek conjugation in *ω*, to the four Latin conjugations, and to the German strong and weak conjugation—is distinguished from the second principal conjugation, which corresponds to the Greek in *μι*, inasmuch as in the active (parasmâip) it has lost the personal termination, so that, *e.g.*, *bhar-a*, "carry" (Zend, *bar-a*), terminates with the class-syllable, to which, in the dual and plural, the personal terminations are annexed (*भरतम् bhar-a-tam* = *φέρ-ε-τον*, *भरताम् bhar-a-ta* = *φέρ-ε-τε*). The loss of the personal termination appears of great antiquity, as in Greek too, *φέρ-ε* is said for *φέρ-ε-θι*, and in Latin *leg-e*, *am-â*, *mon-ê*, and *aud-î*, are likewise devoid of the personal sign.

- The *e* of *lege* is, in its origin, identical with the *i* (from *a*, see § 109³ 1) of *leg-i-te*, and rests on the principle, that in Latin, at the end of a word, *e* is preferred to *i*, hence, *e.g.* *mare* from the base *mar-*

719 In German the strong verbs have in the second person singular of the imperative rejected the class vowel and terminate therefore with the final letter of the root* without, however in most cases containing the actual root itself as the vowel of the root according to the analogy of the present indicative appears at once [G Ed p 983] time weakened as *e g* in the Gothic *bind* from the root *band* to bind = Sanskrit, *bandh* at another time with Guna hence in Gothic *biug* bend from the root *bug* = Sanskrit, *bhuj*, *beit* bite from the root *bit* = Sanskrit *bhid* to cleave (see pp 103 106) The Sanskrit also and Greek retain in the present imperative the Guna augmentations of the present indicative or in general that of the special tenses hence *e g* in the Sanskrit *bodha* know (out of *baudh*) from *budh* and in the Greek *φενυε* from *φω* The German weak verbs retain their class character corresponding (see § 109 6) to the Sanskrit *aya* of the tenth class the syllable *ya* however is contracted to *i* (Gothic *ei* = *i*) as in general the syllable *ya* at the end of a word lays aside its vowel and changes the *y* into one Compare *e g* the Gothic *tam ei* 'I am' from *tamya* with the Sanskrit causal *dam aya* Latin *dom a*, Greek *δαμ αε* In the second weak conjugation let *laug θ* lick be compared with the Sanskrit causal *lēh aya* from *lih* to lick in the contraction of *a(y)a* to *θ* however *laugθ* approaches nearest to Latin imperatives like *dom a* as the Gothic *θ* = *a* (§ 69) In the third weak conjugation compare *hab-at* *thah at* *sil-at* with the Latin forms of like signification *hab ē*

* Thus in Latin *dic* for *dice* With regard to *fer* it is to be observed that *fero* even in the indicative is connected rather with the Sanskrit *bhar* (*bh i*) of the third class than with that of the first Thus as *fer s fer t fer tis* correspond to *bi bhar shi bi bhar ti bi bhre tha* so *fer* answers to *bibhri lu* (from *bibhar dhu*) the personal termination being suppressed, as in *es* = Greek *σ θ* Sanskrit *ē dhu* from *ad dhu* (for *as dhi*)

tac-ê, sil-ê, where the *ê* is a contraction of *ai*, and answers to the Sanskrit *ay* of *aya* (see p. 110) In the second person plural *tam-yi-th* (from *tam-ya-th*) corresponds to the Sanskrit *dam-aya-ta*, Latin *dom-â-te*, Greek *δαμ-άε-τε*. In Greek and German the imperative second person plural is not distinguishable from the present indicative. In Sanskrit, however, the imperative has the termination of the secondary forms (*ta*) opposed to the *tha* of the primary, thus दमयत *damayata*, "tame ye," opposed to दमयथ *damayatha*, "ye tame." In Latin *domâte* is distinguished from *domâtis*, since the latter form answers to the Sanskrit dual indicative present (दमयथस् *damayathas*, Gothic *tamyats*), the former to दमयत *damayata*, "tame ye" (see § 444.) The termi-

[G Ed p 984] nation *to*, of the second and third person of the so-called future of the imperative, and the Greek termination *τω* of the third person singular, correspond to the Vêdic termination *tât*, which answers for the second as well as the third person,* and in the latter, as has already been remarked, is most correctly retained in the Oscan *tud* (*licitud, estud*) As in तात् *tât* the expression of the person is twice contained, so it is in the Latin second person plural *tôte*, for which in Sanskrit तात *tâta* might be expected, which, however, does not occur. In the third person plural *nto* answers to the Greek *ντων* (*legunto* = *λεγόντων*), which was before compared with the Sanskrit middle forms in *antâm* (*φερόντων* = *bharantâm*).

720 The Sanskrit termination नु *tu*, plural अन्तु *antu* is derived from the pronominal base ता *ta*, by weakening the *a* to a vowel of middle weight, while in the present indicative, as

* See § 470 The edition of the First Book of the Rig V by Fr. Rosen, which has appeared since this work was commenced, has confirmed *tât* to be the termination of the second person of the imperative At H XLVIII 15 occurs प्र नो यच्छतात् *pranô yachchhatât*, "give us," and at CIV 5 चकृन्तात् *chakrîntât*, "support," from the intensive of the root कृ *krî*, "to make"

“spread out wood” (compare Sanskrit यम् *yam*, in the special tenses यच्छ *yachh*, with the preposition आ *ā*, “to extend”) So also in the Vend S, p 39, for *huvvanha* we ought to read *hunvanuha*, according to the manuscripts made use of by Burnouf, and for *visanha*, “hearken” (V.S, p 123), perhaps also *vīsanuha* will occur

“Remark In the Latin Edition of my Sanskrit Grammar [G Ed p 986] mar of the year 1832 (p. 330) I have already taken the form *hunuvanuha*, or, as the lithographed manuscript reads, *hunvanha*, as the imperative middle, and translated *frāmanm hunvanuha kharēte* (according to Anquetil, ‘*qui me mange en m’inviquant avec ardeur*’) by ‘*me celebra ad edendum.*’ Besides *nu*, the conjugational character of the fifth class, that of the first class is, as is *l. c.* remarked, added to the root *hu*, for without this inorganic affix the form would be *hunushva* (=Sanskrit सुनुष *sunushva*). It is certain that the Zend root *hu* must in Sanskrit be सु *su*, and the opinion which Burnouf ascribes to me (Journal Asiatique, 1844, Dec, p 467), that the Zend *hu* rests on the Sanskrit हु *hu*, ‘to offer,’ has been expressed by me neither at p. 781, nor in my Critical Grammar, p. 330, nor anywhere else. That a Zend *h* never corresponds to the Sanskrit ह *h* has been expressly remarked in § 57, and it is also remarked in § 53 that *h*, in an etymological respect, never corresponds to the Sanskrit ह *h*, but always to the pure or dental स *s*. Had I wished to compare, therefore, *l. c.* its Sanskrit type with the Zend *hu*, I could only have referred to one of the roots सु *su*, of which one, like the

the following word (see § 518 p 737) The transitive meaning of the root *śnā* is, on the other hand, usually represented by *śnādhi* in the active, e g V S p 233, 8. *aétāo vaśtrāo fraśnādhayēn* “let them wash these clothes”

Zend *hu* belongs to the fifth class. On the meaning *celebrare* which I have given to the Zend *hu* (according to Anquetil *invoquer avec ardeur*) I did not desire to lay any particular stress for my chief object was to settle the value of the grammatical forms which Anquetil mistook and I wished to recognise in the interrogative form a middle imperative termination based on the Sanskrit *a sua* and in *khareteš* the dative of an abstract substantive while according to Anquetil's translation (*qui me mange*) it might be taken for a third person present. In both respects I now find myself supported by the Sanskrit translation of Nerosengh which is given (*l c*) by Burnouf and which renders *𐬵𐬀𐬯𐬀𐬢𐬀* *huncanuha* by *परिभक्षति कुरु* *parisanskṛdram kuru** and *𐬵𐬀𐬯𐬀𐬢𐬀* *khareteš* by *खादन्त्या* *khādanṭya* (for the eating or the food). The explanation of the appended commentary is *𐬵𐬀𐬯𐬀𐬢𐬀* *𐬵𐬀𐬯𐬀𐬢𐬀* *dhārārtham* [G D p 98] *sanmanaya* † *l c* on account of the food honor (me) ‡. The root *𐬵𐬀* *hu* occurs several times in the ninth Ha of the Izeschne from which our passage is taken and indeed in the third person of the imperfect *hunāta* (once *humāta* with the affix of the character of the first class) which Anquetil everywhere paraphrases by *ayant invoqué et se lamentant humble*. I have translated it (*l c*) by *laudabat* and regret that Burnouf has not given us Nerosengh's trans

* Burnouf remarks *Nos manuscrits sont très-confus en cet endroit celui de Manahdji a 𐬵𐬀𐬯𐬀𐬢𐬀* *sanskarascharu* mais je ne suis par sur du 𐬵𐬀 *sch* le numero II l' lit 𐬵𐬀𐬯𐬀𐬢𐬀 *sansl drant* u avec 𐬵𐬀 *sch* au dessus de la ligne. However, I have no doubt that Burnouf is right in reading *कुरु* *kuru*.

† So Burnouf reads for the 𐬵𐬀𐬯𐬀𐬢𐬀 *sanmārāya* of the manuscripts, which yields no sense.

‡ Burnouf translates *honore moi comme nourriture* in which I cannot agree with him for *adhārārtham* can only mean on account of the food not 'as food' and in *khādanṭya* too as the translation of *khareteš* the causal relation is apparent.

lation of this expression also. Undoubtedly, however, the circumstance that the verb derived from *hu* everywhere refers to 𐬕𐬀𐬎𐬌 *haoma*, the personified Sôma-plant, speaks in favor of Burnouf's opinion, that the 'Zend *hu* has the same signification as the corresponding Sanskrit root 𑖦𑖤 *su*; viz, 'to press out the sap,' where it is to be further remarked, that in Sanskrit the verb from this root is especially used in relation to the Sôma-plant. I avail myself of the occasion which has led me to speak of the ninth Ha of the Izeschne, to correct an error to which I was led by a false reading of the lithographed manuscript of the V Sâde. Four times in this Ha the masculine nominative of the interrogative occurs before the accusative of the pronoun of the second person. The lithographed manuscript reads once 𐬕𐬀𐬎𐬌 𐬀𐬎𐬌 *kašê thuanm* (p 42), once 𐬕𐬀𐬎𐬌 𐬀𐬎𐬌 *kašê thuanm* (𐬀 *s* by mistake for 𐬀 *s*, p 40), once 𐬕𐬀𐬎𐬌𐬀𐬎𐬌 *kašêthwanm* (p 41), and once 𐬕𐬀𐬎𐬌𐬀𐬎𐬌 *kašithawanm* (p 39). Here, therefore, two readings support the separation of the two pronouns, and two their combination, and at first, under the supposition that the form of writing in which they were separated was the right one, I believed we should recognise in the *ê* or *z* of *kašê* and *kašz*, an appended pronoun, like the Greek demonstrative *οὗτος*, *ἐκεῖνος* (see § 157 p. 185 G. ed. Note*, and Gram Crit Add ad r 270). The *s*, however, I regarded as the sign of the nominative, and this it really is, for though the Sanskrit termination *as* in Zend regularly becomes *ô*, but *s* in the middle and beginning of a word before vowels *h*, there might, how-

[G Ed p 988] ever, be an exception in the case of the termination *as* occurring before an enclitic, where *as* might retain its original form, for in Zend 𐬀 *s* is not so much the palatal sibilant as the 𑖦 in Sanskrit is, for the latter occurs before no other mutes but palatals only, while 𐬀 occurs before mutes of all organs (see § 49), and before mutes which are not palatals always corresponds to

the Sanskrit सु except before p where this springs from the Sanskrit i as $e g$ in सुसु उप = Sanskrit सु सु As however we learn from the comparison of the various readings of the Paris manuscripts which has in the mean time been published by Burnouf (Yacna Note R p 131) that सुसु *las* and the combination of the interrogative with the following सुसु *thucanm* there is the prevailing reading (we find the words joined seven times and separated only five times while e occurs seven times i twice and e three times) it admits of scarce any doubt that the vowel which stands between *las* and *thucanm* is inserted only to assist the utterance and that we must regard *lasthucanm* as the original form so that as is the case before the enclitic particle *cha* the sibilant of the nonnarrative has maintained itself under the protection of the following consonant and remained too when a conjunctive vowel was inserted to aid the pronunciation*. I shall not decide whether this vowel must necessarily be an e and could not be either i or a Let however the quite similar case be considered where between the preposition सु *us* and the verb सुसुसुसु *hustam* in the lithographed manuscript at least at one time e at another i at another a occurs as the vowel of conjunction (see § 518 p 737) We may indeed expect that in all places where the lithographed manuscript has i or a some one or other of the manuscripts will have e and undoubtedly this the shortest of all the vowels is best adapted for insertion as a mere vowel of conjunction as too it is regularly used for this

* Thus as ought to have been remarked in § 47 the forms सुसुसुसु *bitya* "the second" and सुसुसुसुसु *thritya* the third point to a time when the i of the Sanskrit *dwitīya tritīya* was still present on which account the y has not communicated an aspiration to the preceding consonant as is the case $e g$ in *suritīya* where the combination of the T sound with the semi vowel is primitive

Nerosengh translates by मा समीहस् i.e. wish or obtain me and Burnouf (Journ As Dec [G 1 d p 990] p 165) by *implore moi* *. We may also here preliminarily remark that for the first time we have lately learned through Rawlinson's ingenious discoveries that in Old Persian also the pronouns readily attach themselves as enclitics to the preceding word and that if we read without the *a* (which in Old Persian is sometimes contained in the consonants and sometimes not) *y* which is regularly added to the *i* at the end of a word as well as to the diphthong *ai* the Old Persian enclitics will in like manner be all monosyllabic. For this as for other reasons I read *aurama-dāmay* Auramazda to me for Rawlinson's *mayā* (former reading, *myā*).

722 The first person of the third numbers of the imperative follows in Sanskrit and Zend a peculiar principle of formation which as has been already remarked corresponds rather to the subjunctive or *Let* than to the other persons of the imperative. And *ā* is prefixed to the

* Anquetil altogether omits to translate this expression for which in the lithographed manuscripts (p 39) *yā san'a* occurs by mistake. Burnouf thinks he recognises in the root *yā* the Sanskrit याच् *yāch* to demand ask but a difficulty arises in the *ā* for Sanskrit च् *ch* of which I have elsewhere met with no example. The root याच् *yāch* as substitute of यम् *yam* answers better on account of its final consonant, as च् *ch* in Zend is regularly represented by *s*, on which account I have above (§ 721 p 98 first line) referred *āyāsanuha* spread out to this root. Here however the meaning of the Sanskrit यम् *yam* याच् *yāch* आ *ā* prefixed does not suit. Perhaps the *ā* (*mānm*) *yānuha* in question is radically identical with the frequently occurring *āyāse* I praise (or *invole* ?) which leads to a Sanskrit root *yas* which is only retained in यशस् *yasas* glory. With regard to the Zend *ē* for the Sanskrit *a* or *ā* see § 4. It is probable however that in *āyāse* as also in genitives in *jēhē* for *yāhē* and in present forms in *yēmi* besides the preceding *y* the vowel also of the following syllable has an assimilating influence in the change of *a* or *ā* to *ē* hence we find indeed *āyēse* but not *āyāsanuha* but *ayā anuha*.

pp 132 479 𐬕𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬵𐬀𐬊𐬭𐬀 *krenav â nê* Let me make
(=Sanskrit *kṛin avanti* from *karnav â nê*)

723* In verbs of the first principal conjugation and of the ninth class as also in roots in *a* of the second or third class the modal *â* combines with the pre [G Ed p 99']

ceding *a* or *â*, hence *e g* 𐬁𐬀𐬭𐬀 *bharâni* let me carry
Zend 𐬁𐬀𐬭𐬀 *barâni* middle 𐬕𐬀𐬭𐬀 *barânê* (V S p 480)
So 𐬕𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬵𐬀 *visânê* I will obey * 𐬕𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬵𐬀 *yazanê* (sec
p 278) Let me offer, 𐬕𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬵𐬀𐬵𐬀 *perenunê* Let me de-
stroy (V S p 335 compare Burnouf Yrçnr p 530 ff)
𐬕𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬵𐬀𐬵𐬀𐬵𐬀 *yaozhdathâni* Let me purify l c p 480) †
After 𐬵𐬀 *y* comes *ê* for *â* hence *e g* 𐬵𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬵𐬀𐬵𐬀𐬵𐬀 *varedhayeni*

Ahriman! I will destroy the Daeva created people Upon which (p 478)
Ahriman says to Zoroaster

𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬵𐬀𐬵𐬀𐬵𐬀𐬵𐬀 𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬵𐬀𐬵𐬀𐬵𐬀𐬵𐬀 𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬵𐬀𐬵𐬀𐬵𐬀𐬵𐬀 𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬵𐬀𐬵𐬀𐬵𐬀𐬵𐬀
mamê dama merichamîha ashaum Zaratuštra

' Slay not my people O pure Zoroaster!'

* V S p 124 𐬕𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬵𐬀𐬵𐬀 𐬕𐬀𐬭𐬀 𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬵𐬀 *azem tê visânê* ' I will obey
thee' so l c are other imperatives in the sense of the future as
𐬵𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬵𐬀𐬵𐬀𐬵𐬀𐬵𐬀 𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬵𐬀𐬵𐬀𐬵𐬀 𐬕𐬀𐬭𐬀 𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬵𐬀 *a em tê gâthao varêdhayêm*
I will make thy lands increase (make fruitful, Anquetil p 271 *je*
rendrai votre monde fertile et abondante)

† See § 637 I am now however of opinion, in departure from what
has been remarked at p 112 that the *th* of *dath* is a substitute of *dh* and
I take *da* as the syllable of reduplication as in the Sanskrit *dadhâmi* The
𐬵𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬵𐬀𐬵𐬀𐬵𐬀 *mdathyann* deponent therefore mentioned at p 112
corresponds to the Sanskrit 𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬵𐬀𐬵𐬀 *mdadhyus* and 𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬵𐬀𐬵𐬀𐬵𐬀𐬵𐬀 *daithita*
to the Sanskrit 𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬵𐬀𐬵𐬀 *ni dadhita* (§ 70') In the genitive of the participle
of the reduplicated preterite 𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬵𐬀𐬵𐬀𐬵𐬀 *dathusho* corresponds to the Sanskrit
dadhushas while in the nominative 𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬵𐬀𐬵𐬀𐬵𐬀 *dâdhvao* (=Sanskrit
𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬵𐬀𐬵𐬀 *dadh + van*) and in the accusative 𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬵𐬀𐬵𐬀𐬵𐬀𐬵𐬀 *dadhvaonhem*
(=Sanskrit *dadh + iânsam*) the alteration of *dh* to *th* does not take place
an alteration which most probably is found only in the weak cases
Perhaps in Zend *th* is considered weaker than *dh* and *d* and thus may be
the reason that the interrogative verb where it appears without a prepo-
sition or other incumbrance of composition or even with compositional
incumbrance but without reduplication also exhibits no *th* in the examples
with

with which I am acquainted, while, where the reduplicated verb is burthened by composition, *th* almost universally occurs in the base-syllable though *dh* also is occasionally found, *e g* in *yaoshdadhānti* (Burnouf Yaçna, p 360) In cases where the forms with *th* follow the analogy of the Sanskrit first class, as *e g* in *mdathēm*, “I have made,” (Burnouf l c) I regard the vowel which follows *th* not as the class vowel, but, as in the conjugation of the root स्था *sthā*, स्था *sthā*, as the shortening of the radical vowel (see § 508) I also now consider the verbal-theme *snādha*, “to wash,” as a compound of the root *snā* and *dhā*, the radical vowel of the latter being shortened (compare Benfey, Lexicon of Roots, II 34) The perhaps not numerous forms may appear surprising in which the vowel of the syllable of reduplication of the Zend root *dhā* (without a vowel preceding, *dā*) is long, as in the example mentioned by Burnouf (l c) *mdhāthayēn*, “they may lay down” Here either the lengthening of the syllable of repetition is a compensation for the shortening of the base-syllable, or the genius of the language takes *dāth* for a secondary root, without being conscious that the *d*, with its vowel, is in fact a syllable of reduplication, as in Sanskrit the forms *dē-hi*, “give,” (from *dad-dhi*, Zend *das-di*) and *dhē-hi*, “place,” (from *dhad-dhi*), no longer give the impression of reduplicated forms

† *Yasnayémi* is a denominative from *yasna* = Sanskrit यज्ञ *yajna*, 'offering'

Remark — An explanation—and I am now much inclined to adopt it—might be given of the *i* of the terminations *āni āni* &c., in the first principal conjugation as follows viz. by recognising in it only the lengthening of the short *a* of the class syllable while only *ni* &c. is [G Ld p 294] regarded as the personal termination. There is a twofold occasion however for the lengthening of the *a* of the class syllable, first that in the *2nd* mood or subjunctive to which according to its principle of formation the first person of the imperative belongs the *a* of the class syllable is lengthened (see § 13) and secondly that especially before pronominal consonants of the first person in case of their being followed by vowels an *a* originally short is lengthened and hence forms like *ami āni āni* &c. nowhere occur where *āni* also is not to be looked for. On the latter principle may be explained the *i* of *dhraś i ni* *libhā i ni* *yunay-i ni* *chinav-i ni* and *kara i ni* so that we may assume that the *a* which according to § 16 is added to the subjunctive is lengthened simply on phonetic grounds. It is certain that the first person plural of the 1st cited *bhūat* he may be can only be *bhūima* and this would be at the same time the imperative of the fifth norist formation (see § 53). The first person plural of the Old Persian *ahaty* he may be quoted in § 16 is most probably *ahāmi* which would correspond to the Sanskrit imperative *asīma*. If this view be correct then in the ninth class also the words *yu nā i i* *yu nā i a* &c. must not be divided into *yu nā i ni* &c. but we must assume that as here an *i* in the original word precedes the personal termination no further *a* sound could be added. The ninth class already meets the requirement for fulness of form in the first person in this way that the syllable *nā* is not as in the weak forms weakened to *ni*. The roots *dī* and *dhā* which reject their *i* before the heavy terminations retain the same in the imperative by reason of their inclination to fulness of

form, thus e g *da-dâ-ma*, *da-dhâ-ma*, not *dad-ma*, *dadh-ma* (compare § 481.)”

724 Besides the middle termination *ânê*, which surpasses the Sanskrit in correct retention of the original form, the Zend also recognises the abbreviated form *âi*, of which, however, it makes but unfrequent use. An example is *𐬨𐬀𐬭𐬀* *vîšâi* in the fourth Card of the Visperîd (Vend. S., p. 55), where *𐬨𐬀𐬭𐬀* *azēm vîšâi*, occurs seven times, which Anquetil renders by “*j’obeis*” With the preceding imperative *âštâya*, “bring,” * the present indicative accords best,

[G Ed p 995] so that, in the want of positive examples, we might believe *𐬨𐬀𐬭𐬀* *vîšâi*, to be only a more energetic form for the present indicative *vîšê*. The form *𐬨𐬀𐬭𐬀* *yazâi*, which occurs several times in the twenty-second Fargard of the Vend., is rendered by Anquetil “*rendez hommage*,” and the context requires also the second person, for *yazâi* &c expresses the command of Ormuzd directed to Zoroaster, to whom he promises, as the reward of the reverence required of him, that which follows after *dathânî*, “I will give” (=Sanskrit *दातुं dadâmi*, first person imperative). I see, therefore, no reason to assent to Burnouf (Yacna, p. 495) in placing the words *𐬨𐬀𐬭𐬀* *yazâi*, &c in the mouth of Zoroaster, and I take *yazâi* to be the imperative active of the causal form, and, indeed, as a contraction of *yazaya*, whether it be that this expression really has a causal signification, and means “let honor,” or that the causal form has here the same meaning as the primitive form, as in Sanskrit also is not unfrequently the case. In a phonetic view, the relation of *yazâi* to *yazaya* resembles that of *𐬨𐬀* *nâi*, “conduct,” to the Sanskrit *नय naya*. With regard to *yazâi*, as well as to *nâi*, we must assume that, in compensation for the suppres-

* Literally, “make to come,” the causal of *štâ*, “to stand,” with the preposition *â*. Anquetil takes the adjoining accusative as a nominative, and *âštâya* as the third person

sion of the final *a* the *a* of the preceding syllable is lengthened or which comes to the same thing the *a* of the final syllable is transposed nearly as in the change of *ashatan* pure into *ashatum* (with *m* for *n*) in the vocative. The form *ṣay nāi* conduct (thou) occurs six times at the end of the ninth Ha of the Izaschne in combination with *nāim** (Vend S p 47) Anquetil (p 112) renders [G Ed p 996] *ṣayṣayṣay nāsemndi Ichrepm* by *enseignez moi le moyen d'aneantir son corps*. The literal meaning however is conduct the body to destruction (e g *azous* of the snake = *ahēš*). Here perhaps the composition of the imperative with the accusative *Ichrepm* may have given occasion for the contraction of *naya* to *nāi*. This however does not prevent the assumption that, even without any special occasion in the imperative a transposition of the *a* of the syllable *ya* may take place since the Zend is particularly fond of transposing the *a* of the syllables *ya* and *ia** and forming them into a diphthong with the vocalized semi vowel. I shall return to this subject in the emendations to § 12.

725 In respect to Syntax it deserves notice that the first person of the imperative in Zend not only as has been already shewn by some examples sometimes supplies the place of the future indicative but is also used as the subjunctive governed by *yatha* that. Thus in a passage quoted with a different object by Burnouf (Yaçna p 427) from the fourth chapter of the Yescht de Gosch *ṣayṣayṣayṣay ṣayṣay yatha azem bandayēni* that I bind *ṣayṣayṣayṣay ṣayṣayṣay ṣay ula bastem i dhayēni* &c. and (that I) bind those who are bound *ṣayṣayṣayṣay ṣay ṣayṣayṣayṣay ula bastem upanayēni* and (that I) conduct those who are bound. On passages of this kind Burnouf's opinion may be based that the form in *du* (or *ēni*) in point

* This word is not once written quite correctly in the lithographed manuscript the correct reading however may be easily found by a comparison of the several erroneous ones.

of sense, belongs as well to the imperative as to the potential, while he altogether denies that the middle form in *ânê* (or *ênê*), which was first brought to light by Fr. Windischmann (Journal of Gen. Literature, Jena, July 1834, p 133), belongs, in point of signification, to the imperative, and explains the forms in *âi* according to their meaning as genuine imperatives middle of the first person* (Yagna, p 530, Note) I

[G Ed p 997] cannot assent to this opinion as, e.g., *𐬕𐬀𐬎𐬭𐬀* *yazânê*, "let me offer," in the passage (p. 299) quoted above, has as imperative a meaning as the first person for the most part admits of, while *viâi* (§ 721), according to its signification, is rather a present indicative, and *yazâi* (l c) is explained as the second person imperative active of the causal.

726. Among the European sisters of the Sanskrit, the Gothic alone presents a first person of the imperative, but only in the plural, where, e.g., *visam*, "*simus*," (Luc xv 23) corresponds to the Sanskrit *vasâma*, "*habilemus*," without, however, being formally distinguished from the present indicative, as the Sanskrit terminations *mas* and *ma* in Gothic are represented by simple *m*, except in the subjunctive, where *ma* corresponds to the Sanskrit *म* *ma* of the secondary forms. It has been already remarked, that, according to its formation, the imperative of the Slavonic and Lithuanian does not belong to the proper imperative (see §§. 677 679)

I here give a general view of the points of comparison which have been arrived at for the imperative present

	SANSKRIT	ZEND	GREEK	LATIN	GOthic
1 p sg. act	<i>han-â-ni</i> ,	<i>jan-â-ni</i>
	<i>bhar-â-ni</i> ,	<i>bar-â-ni</i> ¹
1 p sg mid	<i>karav-âi</i> ,	<i>karav-â-nê</i>
	<i>bhar-âi</i> ,	<i>bar-â-nê</i>	

¹ *Barâni* cannot be supported by quotation, but is clearly deduced from the middle *bar ânê* (§ 723) and the plural *bar âma* (V S p 208)

	SANSKRIT	ZEND	GREEK	LATIN	GOTHIC
1 p pl act	<i>bhar ā-ma</i>	<i>bar ā ma</i>			<i>bair a m</i>
2 p sg act	<i>dē hi</i> ² <i>ē-dhi</i> ⁴ <i>bhar a</i> <i>vaḥ a</i> <i>vaḥ a tāt</i> ⁵	<i>daz dī</i> ³ <i>bar a</i> <i>vaḥ a</i>	<i>(δίδο θι)</i> <i>ῖσ-θι</i> <i>φερ ε</i> <i>ἔχ-ε</i>	<i>veh e</i> <i>veh i to</i>	<i>bair</i> <i>ig</i>
2 p sg mid	<i>dat sua</i> ⁶ <i>bhar-a sua</i>	<i>bar an uha</i> ⁷	<i>δίδο-σο</i> <i>φερου (from φερ ε σο)</i>	[G Ed p 998]	
2 p du act	<i>bhar a tam</i>		<i>φερ ε τοι</i>		<i>bair a ts</i>
2 p pl act	<i>bhar a ta</i> <i>bibhri-ta</i> <i>vaḥ a ta</i>	<i>bar a ta</i> <i>vaḥ-a ta</i>	<i>φερ ε τε</i> <i>ἔχ ε τε</i>	<i>fer te</i> <i>veh i te</i>	<i>bair i th</i> <i>ig i th</i>
2 p pl mid	<i>bhar a dhutam</i>	<i>bar a dhu: m</i>	<i>φερ ε σθε</i>		
3 p sg act	<i>vas a tu</i> <i>vaḥ-a tī</i>	<i>vanh a tu</i> <i>vaḥ a tāt</i> ⁸	<i>εχ ε τω</i>	<i>veh i to</i>	
3 p du act	<i>bhar a tām,</i>		<i>φερ-ε-τωι</i>		
3 p pl act	<i>bhar a ntu</i>	<i>bar a ntu</i> ⁹			

² *Dē hi* from *dad-dhi* for *dad i hi* from *dad i-dhi*. See §§ 400 481

³ *𐬔𐬀𐬌𐬎* *da-di* from *dad-di*. See § 400 p 632 G ed, where for *da dhi* read *𐬔𐬀𐬌𐬎 da-di* as *adh* occurs only between two vowels. Thus we twice read in V S p 50 *𐬔𐬀𐬌𐬎 da-di mē* 'give to me with *mē* to me enclitic, where we must remember that in Sanskrit also the forms *me mē* 'mei mihi and *tū tē*, *tui tui* are used only enclitically just as in Old Persian *may* and *tay*. We must therefore take the in V S pp 505 507 508 frequently recurring *𐬔𐬀𐬌𐬎 datham tē* 'I will give to thee, as = *dathanūtē* since compounds in *ten* are frequently separated in writing. If however *dathanūtē* is to be taken as one word I should then explain the *th* as being for *dh* on the same principle as that by which the root *dā* 'to lay' in the reduplicated forms, when they appear in composition regularly exhibits *th* for *dh* in the radical syllable (See p 992 G ed Note †). ⁴ I from *ad dhi* for *as dhi*. ⁵ p 906 Note ⁶ For *dad i sua* (See § 481) ⁷ See § 721 ⁸ See p 603 Note †

727 In the Veda dialect and in Zend forms also occur which correspond to the imperative of the aorist in Greek

[G Ed p 999] and, like the latter, have with the augment, which is the true symbol of past time, also laid aside the past signification. To the Greek first aorist, भूय *bhū́sha*, "be" or "become" (see Westerg. r भू, prief अँ) euphonic for *bhū́-sa* = *φῦ-σον*, corresponds. The *ν* of the termination *σον*, if organic, may be deduced from *s*,* and this

* See § 97 With regard to the transition of final *s* into *ν* compare also ἦν, "he was," with the Doric ἦς and आस *ás* of the Védas moreover the suff *θεν* = Sanskrit *tas*, Latin *tus* (§§ 421 531) The form *-θεν*, as it approaches closer to the Sanskrit *tas* and Latin *tus* than *θε* does, must be regarded as more organic than the latter, which, as Buttmann remarks, (§ 116 4 Rem 1), is of frequent occurrence only in certain particles, in which the original meaning ("whence") is not so perceptible, and is found elsewhere but seldom, and where the metric requires it (*ἀντρόθε* Pind., *κυπρόθε* Calimm, *λιβύαθε*, *πάντροθε* Theocrit) Observe, also, the complete rejection of the *ν* in the acc of bases ending in a consonant (*πατέρα* = Sanskrit *pitarām*, Latin *paterem*), as well as, in particular, the abundantly demonstrated fact, that final letters are the most exposed to weakening and complete extinction The weakening of *s* to *n* is too, in itself, not more remarkable than that of *s* to another liquid, viz *z*, which, in Sanskrit, so frequently takes place according to settled laws, and occurs dialectically also in Greek (see § 22), and is found in several kindred languages in certain parts of Grammar, as, *e g*, in Irish the termination *maí* of the 1st p pl represents the Sanskrit *mas*, Latin *mus*, Doric *μες*, which latter, in the common dialect, is corrupted to *μεν* The Sanskrit secondary termination *ma*, which also occasionally occurs in the present, is very probably an abbreviation of *mas* (see § 439), which first appeared after the separation of languages, an abbreviation which enters more extensively into Old Persian, since there the final *s* after *a* and *á* has been dropped from all terminations Therefore I cannot agree with Pott (Etym Forsch II 306)—to whom G Curtius (Formation of the Tenses and Moods, p 27) assents—in deriving only *μες* from *mas*, but *μεν* from *ma*, as if the *ν* were only a later suffix or echo Why, it might be asked, have similar enduring resonant letters (not used like the *ν* ἐφελευστικόν to prevent the hiatus) not been suffixed to other distinct vowel-ending forms, *e g* to the *ε* of the voc of the 2d decl (§ 204), or to that of the dual (§ 209)? The Doric termination *ντω* in the 3d p pl *ἴμπει* (*λεγόντω*, *ποιούντω*, *ἀποτισάντω*) may be regarded with

from θ as e.g. $\delta\sigma\varsigma$ from $\delta\sigma\theta\iota$. We should [G Ed p 1000] therefore have to regard $-\sigma\alpha\theta\iota$ as the original form and derive from that $\sigma\alpha\varsigma$ and afterwards $\sigma\alpha$ with the change of α to o which is preferred before nasals (see p 101). In this manner if the ν of $\tau\nu\pi\sigma\sigma\nu$ appears to be the personal termination and in fact in a place where the Vedic dialect has lost the personal termination (*bhu sha* from *bhū sha-dhu*) then it must be remarked that in Prākṛit also the termination *hi* which is a mutilated form of *dhu*, is much more extensively used than in Sanskrit (see Lassen p 338 Hofer p 185). From $\sigma\alpha\theta\iota$ a middle termination $\sigma\alpha\sigma\theta\iota$ may be developed according to the principle of $\tau\nu\psi\alpha\sigma\theta\omega$ from $\tau\nu\psi\alpha\tau\omega$ $\tau\nu\psi\alpha\sigma\theta\epsilon$ from $\tau\nu\psi\alpha\tau\epsilon$ for as all terminations which in the active begin with τ are preceded in the middle by σ where τ passes into θ (see § 174) [G Ed p 1001] so it cannot be matter of astonishment if from the to be presupposed $\tau\nu\psi\alpha\theta\iota$ is formed $\tau\nu\psi\alpha\sigma\theta\iota$ and hence by rejecting the $\sigma\theta$ $\tau\nu\psi\alpha$ which presents an accidental agreement

at least equal justice as an abbreviation of $\nu\tau\omega$ as *vice versa* $\nu\tau\omega$ may be looked on as a lengthened form of $\nu\tau\omega$ for the Doric dialect has not in all cases preserved the most ancient forms. Iott (l c) finds in a physiological view the interchange between τ and ν difficult to comprehend as though both are dentals, yet the difference in their pronunciation is vast. Still greater however is the difference between that of a mute and the nasal corresponding to its organ, and yet in Sanskrit final mutes if they occur before a nasal pass into the nasal of their organ (*atīhitān mardhni* he stood at the top for *tm*) and in Latin *somnus* stands for *sopnus* in Greek $\sigma\mu\varsigma$ for $\sigma\beta\varsigma$ while reversely in Lithuanian and Slavonic without its being occasioned by the neighbouring letters the *n* of the number nine (Sanskrit *navan*) has become *d* (see § 317) and in Greek the *n* of the suffix $\mu\eta\eta$ *man* Latin *men* has become τ ($\nu\mu\tau$ = $\eta\mu\eta\eta$ *nāman* *nomen*). I am also of opinion that the Vedic termination *tana* in the 3^d p pl. has arisen from *tata* and therefore is only a reduplication of the common termination *ta* and rests therefore on the principle of the Latin imperative ending *tote*, and the Vedic *tat* of the 3^d and 3^d pers. singular.

with the infinitive active of the aorist, as in Latin also, *ama-re*, "be loved" (the last syllable of which is only a fuller form of the reflexive, which we (see §.476.) have recognised in *amo-r*, &c), is in sound identical with the active infinitive. If, however, the imperative *τύπ-σαι* has arisen from *τύπ-σασθι*, the abbreviation is only one degree greater than, in the indicative, that of *ἐτυπ-σας* to *ἐτύπ-σω*. We return to the Vêda-dialect to remark, that to forms like *τυπ-σά-τω*, irrespective of the personal termination, the *ने५नु* *nê-sha-tu* (*sh* euphonic for *s*, see § 21.), "let him conduct," which is cited by Pânini (III 1.81 Schol.), corresponds. In the second person dual *भूषन् भूषशतम्* (*उपभूषन् upa-bhūshatam*, see Westerg, r *भू bhū*, prefix *उप upa*), corresponds admirably to *φύσατον*, and in the third person plural, *श्रोयन्तु* *śrô-sha-ntu*, "let them hear" (Rig. V. I.86 5), in respect of the aoristic suffix, to forms like *λυ-σά-ντων*

728 In Zend, as yet, no imperatives have been found which, like the Vêdic *भूष bhūṣha*, &c, would correspond to Greek imperatives of the first aorist on the other hand, *δίδω dâi-dî*, "give" (V S p. 311 twice, pp 421, 422), corresponds to *δό-ς*, from *δο-θι*, *διδω dâ-ta*, "give ye" (V. S p 224),* to *δότε*, and *dâ-ta*, "do ye," "make ye," (in the compound *διδωδδτα* *yaozhdâta*, "purify ye," V. S, p 367, frequently) to *δέτ-ε* I think I discover a middle imperative aorist in *διδω dâonhâ*, "give thou?" (V S p. 222, l 1 from the bottom), but we require, to understand the passage where this expression occurs, the aid of Neinosengh's

[G Ed p 1002] Sanskrit translation, as well as a comparison of manuscripts It is probable that we ought to read *ददामहा dâomuhâ*, where the long *â* would present no difficulty, as in this passage other originally short *a* at the end of a word are found lengthened In the Vêda-

* I write *dâta* for *dâtâ*, as in this passage long *a* stands for short *a* everywhere at the end of a word

dialect the forms are very numerous which answer to the Greek imperative of the second aorist thus *śrudhi* 'hear thou' = κλῦθι* from *śruomi* (R *śru* Cl 3 irreg) *vay dhi* 'be able' from *śaknomi* (R *val* Cl 3), *pūr dhi* 'fill thou' from *piparmi* (R *pūr* i e *par* Cl 3) To *abhi* 'he was' (aorist of the fifth formation § 573) *bhū tu* 'esto' corresponds. Forms like मुमुग्ध *mumugdhi* 'loose thou' (R *much* 3d person *mum* / *lu*) strongly resemble the Greek like κερραχθι. The Sanskrit form however as appears (see Westergaard) from the indicative form *amumukta* distinctly belongs to the aorist which in the Veda dialect also exhibits similar reduplicated forms combining the personal terminations direct with the root which therefore stand in the same relation to the fifth formation (see § 573) (this being, in the Veda dialect used also in roots ending in a consonant) as that in which forms of the seventh formation (§ 579) do to those of the sixth (§ 576). The *वायुपश्चिद्विदधान्वा* 'grow thou' (Rig Veda I 31 1) which has been differently explained above (§ 709 Note) is perhaps an imperative middle of the seventh aorist formation it would then stand for *vidhadhānu* as [C Lal 1 1003] from *mrig* in the aorist indicative active comes *amumrigam*. The lengthening of the syllable of reduplication would according to § 580 be more authorized in the aorist referred to than in the Veda perfect indicative *viddh* (Rig Veda 52 2) for *viddhé* of the common dialect. The circumstance that no

* So long as a present of the 2d Cl *śromi* does not occur I am inclined to regard the forms of the indicative cited by Westergaard *asratam* 'I heard', *asrot* 'he heard' as aorists of the 6th formation, with Guna of the short radical vowel, which appears lengthened in the Greek κλῦθι as, in forms like *δε* *ν* *ν* the *ν* corresponds to the Sanskrit *u* with Guna. Remark that also in the Vedic aorist *akar* 'he made' *alaram* 'I made' the broad *r* and here the original *lut* according to Indian Grammarians the Canized form of the root occurs while the imper *kridhi* 'make thou' has the shorter form

indicative occurs corresponding to *vāvidhasua*, when regarded as an aorist, would not be a sufficient reason for rejecting this view, for hitherto no indicatives *abhūṣham*, *anēṣham*, *asīṣham*, have been found to correspond to the aorist imperatives mentioned in §. 727., *bhūṣha*, *bhūṣhatam*, *nēṣhatu*, *śrōshantu*. If, however, with Westergaard, we assume potentials and imperatives of the perfect, we can then, with him, derive *vāvidhasua* from the perfect indicative *vāvidhē*. But, according to the signification, the reduplicated imperatives and potentials, which all have a present meaning, are better derivable from the aorist (which in its moods lays aside its past signification together with its augment) than from the perfect, where the reduplication expresses past time, and which, therefore, must remain in the moods likewise; as, *e.g.*, in Gothic, *hairhartyan* signifies "I was called," not "I am called." If, however, in the Vêda-dialect the reduplicated modal forms spring, in part at least, from the perfect, we must then assume that they have, through a perversion, surrendered the past signification, which belonged to them, so that the German subjunctives of the preterite in this respect stand on older ground. The explanation of the reduplicated modal forms from the intensive, attempted in §. 709. Note, is now far from satisfactory to me, and I now hesitate between the derivation of them from the perfect, and their deduction from the reduplicated aorist. To the latter might be referred *ni . sēda*, "seat thyself" (see Westergaard, pp 177, 179), as *अनेशम् anēṣam* (see § 582) presents an analogous indicative. To the *avōḥam* mentioned in the said paragraph the imperative *sanvōḥāvahāi* (1 p du mid Rīg V I 25 17) belongs.

729 Traces of an imperative of the auxiliary future occur in classical Sanskrit. But the few examples hitherto found all belong to the 2d person pl of the middle, viz *प्रसविष्यध्वम् prasaviṣhyadhvam*, "shew ye" (Bhagavad-Gîtâ,

3 10) भविष्यद्भव *bhavishyadhuam* be ye (Maha Bharata III 14394 Ramayana ed Schl I 29 25) and वेत्स्यध्वन् *vētsyadhuam* find ye obtain ye (Maha Bhar I 1111) The conjecture elsewhere expressed that by *samāśhyata* (in Stenzler's Brahmā Vaivartā-Purāṇa Specimen I 35) a future imper act of the 2d p pl is established I must now retract as by repeated examination of the passage I find by the context that for सव्यसा *samāśhyata* which Stenzler renders *alloquimini* we should read *saurakshata* (i e *arcete*) *

CONDITIONAL

[G Ed p 1005]

730 The Sanskrit conditional bears the same relation in respect of form to the auxiliary future that the imperfect does to the present i e the augment is prefixed to the root and the secondary personal terminations supply the place of the primary hence e g अदस्यम् *adāsyam* I would give and also I would have given answering to *dāsyāmi* 'I will give We may therefore as in departure from my former opinion I am now inclined to do regard the conditional as a derivative from the auxiliary future so that although the substantive verb is contained in it there is no necessity for assuming the existence of an obsolete

* Observe that in manuscripts written in Bengal and especially in the manuscript used by Stenzler the *r* is frequently not distinguishable from the *v*, as is remarked l c p 10 The *य* after the *इ* is added by Stenzler as an emendation The meaning *alloquimini* however does not agree with the context, whilst *arcete principem* corresponds to the sense of the preceding Slok In §1 3. of the same Spec occurs a form worthy of notice in respect of syntax viz the imperative *bruta* as representative of the subjunctive governed by *yadi* if *yadi satyam bruta* if ye speak the truth So in the fifth book of the Maha Bhar the second person plural middle of the imperative *prayachchhadhuam* governed by *chet* if *nachēt prayachchhadhuam amitraghatino yudhi kthvasyā n am abh psitan sua* I am if ye do not give the foe slaying Indishthir his required share In the Rig Veda (1 27 1^o) we find the first person plural of the imperative or *Let* after *yadi* *yadi saknāma* if we can

âsyam, "I would be," or "I would have been," and even though such a form should have existed, we might still regard *âsyam* as a derivative of *asyâmi*, "I will be" (=Lat. *ero, eris*, see § 650), which has disappeared from isolated use, just as *adâsyam* as a derivative from *dâsyâmi*. The circumstance, that in none of the European kindred languages a mood analogous to the one spoken of in Sanskrit is to be found, might lead us to the conjecture, that it is of comparatively late origin, as in Latin the imperfect subjunctive (see § 707), which resembles it most, but has evidently sprung up on Roman ground. Compare *da-rem* from *dâ-sem*, for *dâ-sam*, with अदास्यम् *a-dâ-syam*.

731 The Sanskrit employs but seldom its conditional, which, in the earlier period of the language, is commonly supplied by the potential. A few examples, therefore, may be given here (Manu, vii 20.), *yadi na pranayêd, râyi dandan dandyêshw atandritah | sâlê malsyân nâ 'pakshyan durbalân balavattarâh*, "If the king did not indefatigably punish those

[G Ed p 1006] worthy of punishment, then the stronger would roast the weak on spits." Next, however, follow four potentials, all standing in exactly the same relation, which, nevertheless, the Scholiast explains by conditionals, viz *adyât*, "would eat," by *akhâdîshyat*, *avalîhyât*, "would lick," by *avâlêkshyat*, *syât*, "would be," by *abhavîshyat*, and *prâvantêla*, "would become," by *prâvartîshyat*. In the eighth book of the Mahâ-Bh (Śl 1614) we read, *vijñan hi bhavêt kiñchid yadi karnasya pânthiva | nâ 'smâi hy astrân divyân prâdâsyat bhrigunandanah*, "If any fault attached to Kârnas, O Prince, the son of Bhrigu would not have given him the heavenly weapons." The conditional occurs as well in the antecedent as in the relative sentence, and, in fact, the first time in the sense of the pluperfect subjunctive, l c Śl 709, *nachêd arakshîshya* imañ janam bhayâd durishadbhir êvam*

* For *arakshîshyas* on account of the 2 following

balibhūṣaṇaṁ prapūjitaṁ tathā bhavishyad dīrghatām pramōdanam.

If thou hadst not freed from danger this band assailed by powerful foes then they would have been the joy of their enemies* Thus in the Nāishadhya Chār 1 88 *api va rajam adāvyata chet tadā tvadāshubhir vyadāshyad asān api* If he (Brahmā) had given also the thunder bolt (to thee the God of love as a mark) so would even this have been rent in twain (have been split) by thy darts

Remark—In Zend I know of no instance of the conditional some resemblance to it however may be traced in the form *fraacsyann* at the end of the 11th Hæ of the Izeshne (V S p 739) which Anquetil translates *je parle clairement*. I consider this form to be the first person of the auxiliary future which in the absence of examples I formerly thought must end in [G Ed p 1007] *yem* (see § 601 p 918 G ed). The fact that the first person of the future is very frequently replaced by that of the imperative is perhaps the reason of the rare occurrence of the former. If however I am right in explaining the form *fraacsyann* as the first person of the future it has lost the *i* of the termination *ns* in Prakrit where except in the form in *hum* (see § 615) the termination *mi* of the future auxiliary has everywhere dropped the *i* whereby however the preceding *a* has been shortened hence e g सुमरिस्सुमारिस्सु *sumarissu*. I will call to mind corresponding to the Sanskrit *smarishyāmi*. In Zend through the loss of the final *i* an occasion also for the mutation of the *d* preceding the *m* to *t* has disappeared the termination *dm* however must according to § 61 become *fṛst ann* thus *fṛstannam* = Sanskrit *pṛakshyāmī*. In the same Ha at the end of which occurs the form *fraacsyann* occurs also six times the form *fraacsytā* (V S p 356) which Anquetil in like manner translates by *je parle clairement* or *je vous parle clairement*. Then follow the words which Zoroaster (not Ormuzd as Anquetil

supposes) speaks. If, however, *fiavacyâ* is really a first person, it must still belong to the future only; and there would then, in this form, as compared with that in *amm*, be an abbreviation similar to that of the dual case-termination *bya* for which, in accordance with the Sanskrit *bhyâm*, we should expect *byamm* and to that of the feminine pronominal locative termination *a* (see §. 202) for the Sanskrit *âm*. The occurrence in *fiavacyâ* of a long *a* is in agreement with the fact that, in the *Ia* above mentioned, particularly at the end of a word, *â* is found for an originally short *a*, e. g. in *արծառն ʻraolâ*, "hear ye" If, however, *արարացն ʻfiavacyâ* is not the first person of the future, it can only be taken as the second person of the future imperative, and must then be regarded as a command addressed by Ormuzd to Zoroaster

DERIVATIVE VERBS

732 The appellation "derivative verbs" strictly belongs, in Sanskrit, to denominatives only, for passives, causals, desideratives, and intensives, stand quite as near the root as the ten classes of the so-called primitive verbs, excepting the second class (see §. 109^a 3), which latter may be regarded as the base-

[G. Ed p 1008] form of all the rest. The passive, also, is identical in form with the middle of the fourth class, and the causal with the tenth class, while that form of the intensive, which joins the personal terminations direct to the root, is distinguished from the third class only by strengthening the syllable of reduplication, and in extending it also to the general tenses. And here we must observe that the tenth class also extends a part of its class character to the general tenses. We might as the passive agrees with the middle of the fourth class, and the causal with the tenth class reckon in all twelve classes of verbs, so that, perhaps, the intensives would fall under the eleventh class, and the desideratives under the twelfth, or conversely. It is, however, certain

that the verbs called derivative must be classed in idea and as regards their origin under those which express only the simple verbal notion along with the relations of person time and mood and must also be regarded as later and originating in the first place from these latter. For before there could exist a verb signifying e.g.

I cause to hear or I wish to hear or I am heard there must have existed one more simple with the meaning I hear, and though *śrūyāmi śrūyāmi śrūyāmi* and *śrūya* may be derived from the root itself *śru* more readily than from *śrinomi* I hear or its theme *śrinu* (a contracted form of *śrunu*) still *śrinu* may stand as the base form from which the so called derivative and secondary verbs have proceeded by the suppression of the class syllable *nu* before the characteristic affix of the derivative base referred to just as the causal bases when passives are formed from them lose their characteristic affix *ay* before the passive character *ya* as e.g. [C 11 p 1000] from *śrū aya ti* he causes to hear comes *śrū ya te* (for *śrū ay yate*) he is made to hear. According to this scheme the derivative verbs have in point of fact only the bare root at bottom as formative material but the sole reason of this is that from the primitive verbs whose offspring they are all ingredients are removed which do not belong to the expression of the radical idea in order that the derivative form should not be too unwieldy just as certain comparatives and superlatives spring not from the full base of the positive but from it abbreviated by the removal of the formative suffix (see § 298 pp 408 409 G ed.)

733 Let us now consider the formation of derivative verbs severally beginning with the passives. These in Sanskrit in the special tenses annex the syllable *ya* to the root and join thereto the personal terminations of the middle. The conjugation agrees exactly with the middle of the fourth class (see § 500) so that in the present

in the example given at p. 722 G ed., we have only to annex the middle terminations (see § 512) in the place of the active. I give below the 3d per sing. and pl with the corresponding persons of the middle (for the class peculiarities of which refer to § 109^a) of the roots *budh*, Cl. 1, "to know" (Goth. *ana-bud*, "to command"), *tud*, Cl. 6, "to push" (Lat. *tud*, *tundo*), *vas*, Cl. 2, "to dress oneself" (Goth. *va ga*, "I put on" = caus. *vāsayāmi*),¹ *bhar* (*bhr*), see § 11), Cl. 3, "to bear," *yuj*, Cl. 7, "to bind" (Lat. *yug*, Gr. *ζυγ*), *star* (*str*, see p. 680, Note), Cl. 5, "to spread," "to cover," *prī* Cl. 9, "to gladden," "to love" (Goth. *frupō*, "I love").

[G Ed p 1010]	3D PER. SINGULAR		3D PER. PLURAL	
ROOT	PASSIVE	ACTIVE	PASSIVE	ACTIVE
<i>budh</i> , Cl. 1,	<i>budh-ya-té</i> ,	<i>bōdh-a-té</i> ,	<i>budh-ya-nté</i> ,	<i>b'ōdh-a-nté</i>
<i>tud</i> , Cl. 6,	<i>tud-ya-té</i> ,	<i>tud-a-té</i> ,	<i>tud-ya-nté</i> ,	<i>tud-a-nté</i> ,
<i>vas</i> , Cl. 2,	<i>vas-ya-té</i> ,	<i>vas-té</i> ,	<i>vas-ya-nté</i> ,	<i>vas-anté</i> , ¹
<i>bhar</i> (<i>bhr</i>), Cl. 3,	<i>bhar-ya-té</i> , ²	<i>bibhri-té</i> ,	<i>bhar-ya-nté</i> , ²	<i>bibhri-nté</i> ¹
<i>yuj</i> , Cl. 7,	<i>yuj-ya-té</i> ,	<i>yuk-té</i> ,	<i>yuj-ya-nté</i> ,	<i>yūj-nté</i> ¹
<i>star</i> (<i>str</i>), Cl. 5,	<i>star-ya-té</i> , ²	<i>stri-nu-té</i> ,	<i>star-ya-nté</i> ,	<i>'stri-nu-nté</i> ¹
<i>prī</i> , Cl. 9,	<i>prī-ya-té</i> ,	<i>prī-nté</i> ,	<i>prī-ya-nté</i> ,	<i>prī-nté</i> ¹

¹ See § 459

² Roots in *ar*, which in the present or light form contract this syllable to *ri*, exhibit, in case only a single consonant precedes the radical vowel, the syllable *ri* before the passive character *ya*, which *ri* I consider to be a transposition of *ir*, and the letter *a* a weakening of the old form *ar*, which has remained after a double consonant; hence, *star-ya-té* corresponding to *bhar-ya-té*. With regard to the protection which two combined consonants afford to the primitive syllable *ar*, compare the circumstance, that the imperative termination *hi* (from *dhi*) remains in verbs of the 5th class after two combined consonants, but cannot be supported by a single consonant; thus, *chunu*, "collect," opposed to *āpnuhi*, "obtain" (see § 151). On this principle I would also explain the fact that the Latin root *stā* (=Sanskrit स्था *sthā*, "to stand") has, almost in every case, preserved the original length of the base vowel in advantageous contrast to *dā* (=Sanskrit दā) The transposition of स्मिन् *smi*

to *fi* *bhri*, reminds us of Greek forms like *παρᾶσι* which has been explained above as a transposed form of *παρὰ σι*. I am also now of opinion that in Gothic plural bases like *brothru dauhtru*—whence come *brothryu s* ‘brother,’ *dauhthryu s* ‘daughter’—we must assume a transposition of *ur* to *ru* so that the to be presupposed bases *brothur dauhtur* correspond as weakened forms of *brothar dauhtar* to the Sanskrit genitives *bhrātur duhatur*, which are deprived of their case termination (see § 191 Note)

734 It must be observed that the incumbrance which the root receives in the passive by affixing the syllable *ya* occasionally introduces irregular weakenings [G Ed p 1011] of the root, as *e g* the contraction of *vach* to *uch* (*uch ya te daitur*) analogously with some anomalous forms of the active (*ūchima* we spoke from *u uchima*) so too the contraction of the syllable *ra* to *ri* in the root *प्रश्* *prachh* to ask *पृच्छते* *prichchlyatē* *interrogatur* as *पृच्छामि* *prichchhami* I ask *paprichchhima* we asked compared with *paprachchha* I asked *prashtum* to ask. This principle also explains the fact that some roots in *ā* change this vowel in the passive to the lighter *i* hence *e g* *diya* is the passive base of the root *dā* to give (*diyatē datur*). The Zend on the contrary as a consequence of the same principle shortens the long *au* *a* to *a* at least in the examples before me *𐬨𐬀𐬭𐬎𐬨𐬭𐬀𐬢𐬵𐬀* *nidhayēnte* *deponuntur* * (= Sanskrit *nidhiyante*) *𐬰𐬀𐬨𐬭𐬎𐬨𐬭𐬀𐬢𐬵𐬀* *snayanuha* be washed † (= Skt *snāyasau*),

* Vend S p 246 (𐬨𐬀𐬭𐬎𐬨𐬭𐬀𐬢𐬵𐬀) 𐬨𐬀𐬭𐬎𐬨𐬭𐬀𐬢𐬵𐬀 𐬨𐬀𐬭𐬎𐬨𐬭𐬀𐬢𐬵𐬀 *yamnya naro uesta (rista?) nidhayantē* in qua (terrā) homines mortui deponuntur according to Anquetil (p 20) dans les quels on a mis des hommes morts see Note †

† With middle meaning wash to thee (*zasta* the hands) (see p 957 Note †) Burnouf (*Yacna*, p 361 Note) takes the syllable *ya* of this form not as the passive character which according to him (p 309) must be looked for in Zend little more than in Greek and Latin. It appears to me however that we may be very nearly right in regarding
the

the form of the middle of the fourth Class is identical with that of the passive I prefer to explain in both languages the forms with passive signification as really passives and I adopt for the Sanskrit a middle *jan* of the fourth Class a kind of deponent with the active meaning to bring forth of which however but few examples have been hitherto found as e g Ramay ed Schl I 27 3 पुत्रं जनयन् *putran vy ajayata* [G Ed p 1013] she bore a son (with the prep *vi*) The Zend root *jan* the passive of which frequently occurs in combination with the preposition *us* (= Sanskrit उन् *ut*) likewise rejects the final *n* before the passive character *ya* the preceding *a* however is not lengthened or the long *ā* which had been introduced is again shortened which cannot surprise us as from the first the long *ā* at the end of a root is shortened before the passive *ya* Hence e g *us zayentē* they are born * corresponds exactly to the before mentioned *nidhayēnte* (§ 734) Of the imperfect we find the second and third person singular viz *usazayanha* thou wast born (see § 466 and § 518 pp 676 757 G ed) and *usazayata* he was born †

736 As the middle of Sanskrit verbs of the fourth Class is identical in form and as I believe in origin also with the passive and therefore म्रिये *mriyē* *morior* म्रियते *mriyate* *moritur* might also stand for the passive it may here be remarked that the corresponding verb in Zend the subjunctive of which *mauryāti* frequently occurs (V S p 24)

* Vend S p 136 ႁႃ၊ ႁၢဝ် ႁၢပ်းတီႈ ႁူလၢ ႁၢပ်းတီႈ
 ႁူလၢသၣ်၊ ႁူလၢ ႁူလၢ ႁူလၢ ႁူလၢ di aēbya hacha
nerebya dia nara us-ayeintê mithuana stricha nairyasla duobus ex
Iominibus duo homines nascuntur par feminaque masque Anquetil
 (p 278) translates *de deux hommes naqurent deux hommes distingués*
le mâle s'étant uni à la femelle

† Vend S p 39 *yat hé* (so I read for $\xi\psi$ *he*) *puthro us~ajata* 'that a son was born to him'

has replaced the middle termination by the active, as also in Sanskrit the active termination frequently takes the place of the middle in acknowledged passives. The above-mentioned *marryâti* is, however, so far older than the corresponding San-

[G Ed p 1014] skrit verb, in that it has experienced neither the transposition of *r* to *ri* mentioned at § 733. Note ², (*mri-yatê*, like *bhri-yatê*) nor the weakening of *a* to *i*, but *marryâti*, "*moriatur*," stands for *maryâti*, in consequence of the assimilative power of the *y* (see §. 41), and affords us a new proof of the unoriginality of the Sanskrit मृ *ri*; and shews that in Sanskrit not *mri*, but *mar*, is the true root, whence comes, in Latin, *mor*, which presents to us in the *io*, *iu*, of *morior*, *moriuntur*, a fine remnant of the Sanskrit passive character मृ *ya*. Compare *iu* in *mor-iu-ntur* with the Sanskrit *ya* of *mri-ya-ntê*. The subjunctive *mor-ia-r*, *mor-id-ri*, gives us still more exactly the character of the Sanskrit passive, only that here the Latin *â* appears long, inasmuch as it has absorbed the modal exponent *i*. The Lithuanian also has, in the said verb, preserved the passive character, which we have already (§. 500.) recognised in *gemmu* from *gem-yu*, "I am born," *gim-yau*, "I was born": So we have *mir-iau*, "I died," while the present *mir-sztu*, "I am dying," belongs to a different conjugational form. In Latin, too, may be mentioned *fio* as a remnant of the old passive. I divide the word thus, *f-io*, and regard it as an abbreviation of *fu-io*, (just as in Old Persian *b-iyâ*,† "he may be" = Sanskrit *bhâ-yât*), and therefore analogous to the Sanskrit

² The Gothic also presents a remarkably analogous form to the Sanskrit *jâ-yê*, "I am born," in the isolated form *us-liyanata*, "*enatum*" (Luc viii 6), which presupposes in the present *us-liya*, "*enasco*," and therefore a simple verb, *ku-ya*, "*nasco*," for *kin-ya*, as in Sanskrit, *jâ-yê* for *jan-yê*.

† Euphonic for *byâ*, as *y* seldom unites with a preceding consonant without a preceding *i*.

*bhūyē** exclusive of the middle personal [G Ed p 1015] termination of the Sanskrit Compare therefore *f u nt* with *bhū ya ntē f ie t* with *bhu yē ta f ie mus* with *bhū-ye-mahī* As the Sanskrit passive is frequently used impersonally in expressions like *श्रुयाम् śrūyatām* let it be heard instead of 'hear thou *श्रुयाम् śrūyatām* let it be sent *ममे mamrē* let it be dead I will also here further observe that in Georgic whose grammatical relations with Sanskrit I have elsewhere pointed out† such modes of expression are very common viz in the verbs or tenses called by Brosset

indirect whose element of formation *ia* or *ie* presents an unmistakable resemblance to the passive character compare *e g* *მგონია m-gon ia* it is thought by me (=Sanskrit *मया श्रुते mayā jñā ya tē* it is known by me) for

I think *შემიყვარებია she mi quareb ia* it was loved by me = I had loved (see The Caucasian members &c p 59) But the common Georgic passive also where it is retained corresponds in its principle of formation to the here mentioned *ყ ya* and most clearly in the third person plural *e g* in *შეიყვარებიან she-i quarebian amantur* answering to the active *შეიყვარებენ she i quareben amant* the termination of which in its abbreviation corresponds to our German forms as *lieben* (from *liebent*) I c. p 56

737 Originally the Sanskrit passive character *ya* may perhaps have extended over the general [G Ed p 1016] tenses and in roots ending in *d* or a diphthong I think even

* The passive of *bhu* to be must be looked for only as impersonal in the 3d per sing as we also find the neut of the part fut pass in constructions of this kind *e g* (Hit ed Bonn p 17 90) *तादा नृचारेणा मया धारितार्याम्* mine is it to be thy attendant = I must be thy attendant The idea to become is expressed by the active of *bhu* as *bhātām* means as well I become as I am

† ' The Caucasian members of the Indo European family of languages

in the present state of the language, I recognise a remnant of it, viz in the *y*, which, in the aorist, the two futures, the precativè, and the conditional, precedes the conjunctive vowel *i*, e.g., in *adâyishu*, "I was given," *dâyitâh* and *dâyishyê*, "I shall be given," *dâyishâya*, "may I be given," *adâyishyê*, "I might be given." I am led to this view principally by the circumstance, that that form of the intensive which, on account of its passive form and active signification, I term deponent, retains the passive character in the said tenses and moods after vowels other than *i*, hence, e.g., *achêchâyishu*, "I collected," *chêchâyitâh*, *chêchâyishyê*, "I will collect," from चि *chi*. If the *y* occurred only after अ *â*, it might be assumed, as was formerly my opinion, to be a mere euphonic insertion (see smaller Sanskrit Grammar § 49^a) as, e.g., in *yâ-y-in*, "going," from *yâ* with the suffix *in*. The reduplicated preterite of the passive is in all verbs, like the corresponding tense in Greek, exactly like that of the middle, so that, e.g., ददृशे *dadriśê* signifies, as middle, "I or he saw," and as passive, "I or he was seen." Moreover, the reduplicated preterite or perfect is that one of the general tenses of the passive, which, with the exception of the third person singular of the aorist, is the [G Ed p 1017] only one in common use. I cannot recollect to have seen in any author other general tenses, or other persons than the third singular of the aorist †

* Before the *y* of the passive character *i* and *u* are lengthened, as generally the *y* exerts a lengthening power over *i* and *u* preceding it, except when the *iy* is only a euphonic development of *i* or *î*, as, e.g., in *bhuya*, "timor is," from *bhu* + *as*. Observe, with respect to the lengthening influence of the Sanskrit य्, that in Latin also *y* within a word alone produces for itself length by position.

† This ends in *i*, and wants the personal sign, e.g., *ajam*, "he was born." In this *i* might be recognised a contraction of the passive character य *ya* to this view, however, are opposed forms like *adâyî*, "he

was

38 With respect to the origin of the passive character य ya a very satisfactory explanation I think is given of it by Sir G. H. H. where he mentions that in Bengali and Hindustani the passive relation is expressed by an auxiliary verb which signifies to go य ja (from yind see § 30) in Hindustani and या ya in Bengali in the latter, e g कर्तुं या karta ya signifies I am made as it were I go to making Now in Sanskrit both य 1 and या yā Class 2 signify to go but of these it appears best to keep to the latter root which in Bengali also expresses the passive relation and I believe that the shortening of the syllable या yā to य ya is to be ascribed to the root being burthened by composition which rendered a diminution of the weight of the auxiliary verb desirable The a of the passive ya is therefore radical and not as in the first and sixth Class a conjugational affix it follows however the analogy of the class syllable a just as according to § 309 the root स्था sthā to stand after its abbreviation in स्थ stha subjects its final a to the analogy of [t Id p 1018] verbs of the first and sixth Class Through the middle terminations combined with the appended auxiliary verb and expressing the reflexive relation the auxiliary receives the meaning to go oneself, and while the Bengali कर्तुं या karta ya signifies simply I go to making the Sanskrit compound implies more viz I go (betake) myself to making Compare the Latin constructions like amatum iri to be gone to love remark also teneo in opposition to tendo as also the expressions of such common occurrence in Sanskrit like to

was given because here y is the passive expression the i however is most probably identical with that of अदिदि I was given अदिदि shma we were given अदिदि therefore would be an abbreviation of अदिदि a

* In his edition of Manu B I p 39 and in his Bengali Grammar pp 68 and 69

† I pronounced ja and ji for य is sunned in Bengali like j in English

go to joy," "to go to anger," for "to be rejoiced," "to be angered" we even find *grahanan samupāgamat*, "he went to seizure," for "he was seized," in the Rām. (ed. Schl. I. 1 73)

CAUSALS.

739. The Sanskrit and Zend causal is, in its formative character, identical with that of the verbs of the tenth Class (see § 109^a 6) In explanation of the affix अय् *ay*, in the special tenses अय *aya*, the Sanskrit furnishes the roots गृ २, "to go," and ई १, "to wish," "to demand," "to pray" from both arises, by Guna, before vowels अय् *ay*, and in combination with the character of the first Class, अय *aya* The meaning "to wish," "to demand," appears, perhaps, adapted to represent the secondary notion of the causal verbs, in which the subject completes the action, not by the deed, but by the will thus, *e. g.*, *lārayāmi*, "I cause to make," would properly mean "I require the making," whether it were intended that "any one made," or "any thing was made." But if the causal character springs from a root which originally signifies "to go," we must then observe, [G Ed p 1019] that in Sanskrit several verbs of motion signify also "to make", consequently, *e. g.*, *vēdayāmi* might properly signify "I make to know"

740. Although, as has been remarked (p. 120 G. ed.), all German weak verbs are based on the Sanskrit tenth Class, still that form alone, which has most truly preserved the Sanskrit *aya*, viz that which in Gothic, in the 1st per sing. present, terminates in *ya* (Grimm's first weak conjugation), is used in the formation of causal verbs, or of transitive from intransitive verbs, but not in such a manner that the language, like the Sanskrit, could form a causal from every primitive verb, but rather so that it is content with those handed down from old time These, in Gothic, agree with the Sanskrit causals also in this point, that the radical vowel always appears in the strongest form that the primitive verb has

developed* Hence the weakening of *a* to *i* which the primitive or strong verbs have frequently experienced in the present is not admitted in the causal and the vowels *i* and *u* which are capable of Guna are Gunized and in fact through the original heavy Guna vowel *a* not as in the present of the primitive through *i* (see § 2). In particular in Gothic the causal always exhibits the vowel of the monosyllabic forms of the preterite of the primitive yet without its being possible to say that it is derived from the latter but the causal and the singular of the preterite of the primitive stand with respect to their radical vowel in a sisterly not in a derivative relation. Compare e.g. *satya* 'I place' (R *sat*) with *sita* 'I sit' *sat* 'I sit' and with [G *lāp* 100] the Sanskrit causal *śidayāmi* from the root *śid* perf *śasida* thus *lagyā* 'I lay' from the root *lag* (hign 'I lie' *lag* 'I lay') *nasya* 'I make whole' 'I heal' from the root *nas* (*ganā* 'I recover' pret *gaṇa*) *saggyā* 'I sink make to sink' from the root *saggy* (*siqya* 'I sink' pret *saggy*) *dragkya* 'I drank' from the root *dragh* (*drigla* 'I drink' pret *dragl*) *ur rannya* 'I cause to go up' from the root *ramn* (*ur rana* 'I go up' pret. *ur rann*) Examples of Gunized *u* in the Gothic causal form are the following, *ga-drausya*

'I make to fall down, I throw down' from the root *drus* (*drusa* 'I fall' pret *draus* pl *drusum* compare Sanskrit *dhruans* 'to fall' § 20) *lausya* 'I loosen' from the root *lus* (*fra lusa* 'I lose' pret *laus* pl *lausum* compare Sanskrit 'lū to tear away' 'to cut off') So in Sanskrit e.g. *budhayaṁi* (*ḍ=au*) 'I make to know' 'I awaken' from the root *budh* 'to know' 'to wake up' The following are examples of the Gunizing of *i* to *ai* *ur raiya* 'I set up' from the root *ris* (*ur reisa* 'I stand up

* The *o* forms only are excepted which have arisen from the contraction of re-lu-lieated preterites (see § 100) in Sanskrit however, the *d* e.g. of *śidayāmi* is heavier than the *ḍ* (= *a* + *i*) of *śidima*

root *mar* to die (in its abbreviated form मृ *mr* which Grammarians regard as the primitive) comes the causal *marayāmi* I kill I make to die so in Slavonic from the radically abbreviated मरं *mrā* I die comes a causal मरयं *moryū* I cause to die (Dobr p 361) which perhaps does not admit of citation in Old Slavonic but is confirmed by the Russian морю *moryu* The same is the case with варити *var i ti* to cook (trans) compared with вѣтити *vr ye ti* (intrans) with будити *būd i ti* to wake compared with будити *bū ye ti* to awake (Sanskrit *bodhayāmi* I wake, *budhye* I awake) For the *e* of the primitive the causal receives the heavier *o* hence *e g*, ложити *ro losch i ti* to lay compared with лежити *lesch a ti* to lie The *a* of *sad i ti* to plant properly to set corresponds to [G Ed p 10²] the Sanskrit *a* of *sād ayā-mi* (Goth *satya* I set) while the *ye* of *сѣтити syes ti* to place oneself (euphon for *syed ti* see § 457) has probably first weakened the short *a* of the root to *e* and then (as is commonly the case in Slav) prefixed a *y* Compare the Lithuanian *sėdmi* I sit answering to *sodinu*

I plant with the remark that the Lithuanian *o** (like the Gothic *ō*) frequently supplies the place of the long *ā* as *e g* in the nom pl of feminine bases in *a* (*as-uos* = Sanskrit *aswās* the mares) Here we may also notice the Irish *suidhghaim*

I set I plant (answering to *suidhim* I sit) where *gh* as generally happens in the Irish causal verbs represents the Sanskrit *y* (compare p 110 and Pictet pp 148 149) Of Slavonic causals notice also растити *rast i ti* to increase properly to make to grow (*rast ye ti* to grow') †

* According to Kurschat the *o* in Lithuanian is always long

† Sanskrit *vardhayami* Zend *varidayami* I make to grow I increase The Slavonic verb has received the affix *t* whence the radical *d* must become *s* As however the primitive verb had already an *a* an augmentation of the vowel in the causal was impossible Compare also the Sanskrit *ridh* (from *ardh*) to grow which is probably an abbreviation of *vardh*

вѣсѣти *ves-i-ti*, "to suspend," (*vis-ye-ti*, "to hang"), *na-po-i-ti*, "to give to drink" (*na* prep, *pi-ti*, "to drink"), *po-ko-i-ti*, "to quiet," (*po-chi-ti*, "to rest") As the Slavonic *ѣ ye* is the usual representative of the Sanskrit *ए e* = *ai* (see §. 255 *e.*), so is the vowel relation between *ves-i-ti*, "to suspend," and the root *vis*, "to hang," like that of the Sanskrit *vés-ayā-mi*, "I make to enter," to *viśāmi*, "I go in." The Slavonic root *vis* is also probably identical with the Sanskrit *viś*, which, in combination with the prep *नि ni* in the causal, signifies, among other things, "to annex," "to append," and brings us, therefore, very near the signification of the Slavonic causal, viz "to suspend," as

[G Ed p 1023] generally the Slavonic and Sanskrit roots approximate in the idea of "approaching" (अभिप्राय *āviś* means "to approach," उपविश *upaviś*, "to seat oneself"). The formal relation of (*na*)*poiti*, "to give to drink," to *pitī*, "to drink," cannot be correctly measured without taking in the Sanskrit, for from a Slavonic point of view it would seem as if *poiti* had arisen from *pitī* by the pre-inscription of an *o*, while, in fact, the *o* of *poiti* is based on the Sanskrit *ā* of the root *pā*, to which the Greek *ω* of *πῶ-θι*, *πίπωκα*, corresponds, as well as the *o* of *ἐπόθην*, as also the Latin *ō* of *pō-tum*, *pō-turus*, and the Old Prussian *uo* of *puo-ton*, "to drink" the *i* of *pitī* is based, like the *ī* of the Greek *πι-θι*, *πί-νω*, on the weakening which has already occurred in Sanskrit of *pā* to *pī*, whence the passive *pī-yatē*, "bibitur," the perf pass part. *pī-ta-s*, "drunken," and the gerund *pī-tuā*, "after drinking." The Slavonic causal has, according to the general principle, preserved in *po* the heavier vowel of the root, and that which stands nearer to the original *ā*. The relation of *po-koi-ti*, "to quiet" (*po-ko-i-ti*, *po* prep), to *po-chi-ti*, "to rest," is, however, of a different kind. For if, as I doubt not, Miklosich is right (*Radices linguæ Slav* p 36) in comparing the Slavonic root *чи chi* with the Sanskrit *śī* (from *kī*), "to lie," "to sleep," it must then be

observed that the said Sanskrit root *as* also the kindred Greek *κείμαι* assumes an irregular Guna augment which extends throughout and which appears in Greek either in the form of *κει* or in that of *κοι* (*κοιτη κοι τοσ κοιμαω* see § 4) To the latter form the Slavonic *ko* of *po lo i ti* corresponds where however the radical vowel is lost for the following *i* is the expression of the causal relation

742 The form *i* in which in Old Slavonic the causal character for the most part appears corresponds exactly to the form into which in Gothic the causal *ya* contracts itself before the appended auxiliary verb [G Ed p 1024] of the preterite (see § 623) and before the suffix of the pass participle therefore as we have in Gothic *sat i da* I placed *sat i th-s* placed (Gen *sat i di s*) so in Slavonic *sad i ti plantare sad i ty plantot sad i shi plantas sad i-m plantamus sad i te plantatis* In the 1st per sing and 3d per pl of the present *ѣуѣ* (from *yo m*) *ѣуѣ* *yaty* (from *yanty*) correspond to the Gothic *ya yand* Sanskrit *ayā mi aya nti* provided that euphonic laws do not introduce an alteration as is the case *e g* in *ѣа ѣаѣ saschdā* for *sadyu* In the imperative (see § 626) the causal character is lost in the modal exponent hence *sadi plantes plantet* (Goth *satyais satyai*) *ѣаѣѣмъ sadyem plantemus ѣаѣѣте sadyete plantetis* (Goth *satyaima satyath*) as *nesi feras ferat* With regard to the preterite of the Old Slavonic causal corresponding to the Sanskrit aorist see § 561 p 808 G ed, where however the *i* of *ѣаѣѣхъ būd i ch* I did wake does not correspond to the Sanskrit *i* of *abōdhi i sham*

I did know but as has already been remarked (§ 562) is the exponent of the causal relation while in Sanskrit the aorist is with the exception of the precative active corresponding to the Greek aorist optative the sole tense in which the Sanskrit diverts itself of the character *aya* (in the general tenses *ay*) As however all causals assume the reduplicated form of the aorist (see § 580) so the incumbrance of the

ВЪРНУТИ *yes-i-ti*, "to suspend," (*vis-ye-ti*, "to hang"), *na-pa-i-ti*, "to give to drink" (*na* prep., *pi-ti*, "to drink"), *po-ko-i-ti*, "to quiet," (*po-chi-ti*, "to rest") As the Slavonic *ѣ ye* is the usual representative of the Sanskrit *ए e* = *ai* (see §. 255 *e*), so is the vowel relation between *yes-i-ti*, "to suspend," and the root *vis*, "to hang," like that of the Sanskrit *vés-ayá-mi*, "I make to enter," to *visámi*, "I go in" The Slavonic root *vis* is also probably identical with the Sanskrit *vis*, which, in combination with the prep *नि ni* in the causal, signifies, among other things, "to annex," "to append," and brings us, therefore, very near the signification of the Slavonic causal, *viz* "to suspend," as

[G Ed p 1023] generally the Slavonic and Sanskrit roots approximate in the idea of "approaching" (*αἰσῶν* *ávis* means "to approach," *αἰσῶν* *upavís*, "to seat oneself") The formal relation of (*na*)*poiti*, "to give to drink," to *pití*, "to drink," cannot be correctly measured without taking in the Sanskrit, for from a Slavonic point of view it would seem as if *poiti* had arisen from *pití* by the pre-insertion of an *o*, while, in fact, the *o* of *poiti* is based on the Sanskrit *á* of the root *pá*, to which the Greek *ω* of *πῶ-θι*, *πέπωκα*, corresponds, as well as the *o* of *ἐπόθην*, as also the Latin *ó* of *pó-tum*, *pó-turus*, and the Old Prussian *uo* of *puo-ton*, "to drink" the *i* of *pití* is based, like the *ι* of the Greek *πι-θι*, *πί-νω*, on the weakening which has already occurred in Sanskrit of *pá* to *pí*, whence the passive *pí-yaté*, "*bibitur*," the perf pass part. *pí-ta-s*, "drunken," and the gerund *pí-tu-á*, "after drinking." The Slavonic causal has, according to the general principle, preserved in *po* the heavier vowel of the root, and that which stands nearer to the original *á* The relation of *po-koi-ti*, "to quiet" (*po-ko-i-ti*, *po* prep), to *pó-chi-ti*, "to rest," is, however, of a different kind For if, as I doubt not, Miklosich is right (*Radices linguæ Slav* p 36) in comparing the Slavonic root *чи chi* with the Sanskrit *śí* (from *kí*), "to lie," "to sleep," it must then be

observed that the said Sanskrit root as also the kindred Greek *κείμαι* assumes an irregular *Gunī* augment which extends throughout and which appears in Greek either in the form of *κεῖ* or in that of *κοι* (*κοιτῇ καὶ τὰς κοιμῶ* see § 4) To the latter form the Slavonic *ka* of *po ko i ti* corresponds where however the radical vowel is lost for the following *i* is the expression of the causal relation

742 The form *i* in which in Old Slavonic the causal character for the most part appears corresponds exactly to the form into which in Gothic the causal *ya* contracts itself before the appended auxiliary verb [G Ed p 1021] of the preterite (see § 623) and before the suffix of the pass participle therefore as we have in Gothic *sat i da* I placed *sat i th s* placed (Gen *sat i di s*) so in Slavonic *sad i ti* *plantare* *sad i ty* *plantat*, *sad i shi* *plantas* *sad i-m* *plantamus* *sad i te* *plantatis* In the 1st per sing and 3d per pl of the present *ŷŷ* (from *yo m*) *ŷŷyaty* (from *ŷanty*) correspond to the Gothic *ya* *yand* Sanskrit *ayā-mi* *aya nti* provided that euphonic laws do not introduce an alteration, as is the case *e g* in *ŷŷŷŷŷŷ* *saschdŷ* for *sadyu* In the imperative (see § 626) the causal character is lost in the modal exponent, hence *sadi* *plantas* *plantet* (Goth *satyais satyai*) *ŷŷŷŷŷŷ* *sadyem* *plantemus* *ŷŷŷŷŷŷ* *sadyete* *plantetis* (Goth *satyaima satyairh*) as next *feras* *ferat* With regard to the preterite of the Old Slavonic causal corresponding to the Sanskrit aorist see § 561 p 808 G ed where however the *i* of *ŷŷŷŷŷŷ* *bŷd i ch* I did wake does not correspond to the Sanskrit *i* of *abŷdth i sham*

I did know but as has already been remarked (§ 562) is the exponent of the causal relation while in Sanskrit the aorist is with the exception of the precativ active corresponding to the Greek aorist optative the sole tense in which the Sanskrit divests itself of the character *aya* (in the general tenses *ay*) As however all causals assume the reduplicated form of the aorist (see § 580) so the incumbrance of the

root by the reduplication, combined with the augment, is perhaps the reason of the loss of the causal character perhaps even the reduplication is held as compensating for the causal expression, just as, in Latin, *creto*, opposed to the unreduplicated and intransitive *creo*, or as in *arguo*. Sanskrit *ṛajanmi*, "I beget," opposed to *nasco* from *ṛaj* *ca*.

743 The Lithuanian very seldom uses for the formation of causals from primitive verbs the forms contracted in § 596 with the Sanskrit *अय* *aya*. The only examples which [G Ed p 1025] seem to me are *žindau*, "I cause to suck," from *žindu*, "I suck," and *grāu-jū*, "I pull down (and let to fall in) a house," from *grau-u*, "I fall in like a house." The *u* of *grāu-u* appears to be only a development from the *ā*, as, in Sanskrit, forms like *bhāhūa*, "I wash," "he washes," from *bhā*. If we take *grā* as the root, the causal form *grāu-jū* corresponds in its vowel movement to Sanskrit causals like *bhāu-ayā-mi*, "I make to be," "I bring into existence," from *bhā*, "to be." The usual termination of Lithuanian causals is *inu* (pl *ina-me*), by which, as in Sanskrit by *aya*, are formed denominatives also, as, *e g*, *ilga-inu*, "I make long," a denominative causal from *ilga-s*, "long." The *v* of these forms, in departure from that mentioned above (§ 196, p 718 G ed), extends over all tenses and moods, as well as to the participles and the infinitive, for I cannot agree with Michke (p 98 10) in considering it to be a deviation from this rule, that before *s* (according to Sanskrit principles) it passes into the weakened nasal sound, which I express, like the Sanskrit *anuvāra*, by *n* (see § 10) thus, *e g*, *laupsim-su*, "I will praise."

744 The Lithuanian formations in *inu* agree with the Sanskrit, Zend, German, and Slavonic causal verbs in this, that they love a heavy vowel in the root, so that many have preserved an original *a*, while the primitive has corrupted that vowel to *i* or *e*, whence they appear to us exactly in the light of the German Ablaut system (see p 38, Note)

Thus as *e y* in Gothic to the intransitive *sita* 'I sit' (which is a weakened form from *sala*) a preterite *sit* and a causal *satiþa* 'I set,' correspond so in Lithuanian to the neuter verb *mirsti* 'I die' a causal *mirtinu* 'I cause to die' (Skř *mirsti* *amti* Sclav *mrytu*) answers and to the *gimti* (from *gemti*) 'I am born' represented above (§ 501) as präsive a causal *gaminu* 'I [C. Ed. p. 106] beget' corresponds. The following are causals with *a* answering to the *e* of the corresponding intransitive *gadinu* 'I ruin' 'I kill' answering to *gendu* *užgendu* 'I am ruined' *kankinu* 'I vex' answering to *lenčiu* 'I suffer'. In the Lithuanian causals also in place of the organic *a o* is found answering to the *e* of the intransitive (as in Sclav § 41) for example in *sedinu* 'I plant' answering to *sedti* 'I sit'. There is much that is interesting in the vowel relation of *pa klaidinu* 'I mislead' 'I bring into error' to *pa klysti* 'I mislead myself' (caphon for *pa klaid tu*) for the *y* is in pronunciation identical with *i*. So *pa klaidinu* in respect to its Guna form corresponds very well to the Gothic causals like *hnanþa* 'I humble' and Sanskrit as *lāyāmi* (= *laiday mi*) 'I in *ki* to know' (see 109 6). The same is the case with *at gānēnu* 'I quicken' (properly 'I make to live' compare *gyvati* 'living' Sanskrit *ju* 'to live') the primitive of which *at gyti* 'I recover myself' 'I become fresh again' *hvat* is probably an abbreviation of *at gvyti* *undimti* 'I show myself' (see § 176) contains a stronger Guna vowel than *veti* *dm* 'I see' and corresponds to the just mentioned Sanskrit causal *lāyāmi*. An example of the manner in which a Lithuanian causal has just like its corresponding intransitive, corrupted an original *a* to *e* is *deginu* *uro* answering to the intransitive *degti* *ardeo*.

—

In Sanskrit the fourth Class of the root *lā* (*lājati* *arleo*) represents the intransitive meaning and the first Class (*lādāti* *'uro*) the transitive. On the latter is based the Irish *daíaim* *'uro*

745. The circumstance that the Lithuanian formation *ma* (1st per. sing *mu*), like the Sanskrit *aya*, forms as well causals as denominatives, and that the causals so formed, like the Sanskrit, German, and Slavonic, prefer a powerful radical [G Ed p 1027] vowel, gives us ground, (in variance from the assertion set forth at the end of §. 195., which I gladly retract), for seeking to compare the Lithuanian *ma* and Sanskrit *aya*. We might in the *i* of *ma* recognise the weakened form of an original *a*, as it appears also in the forms mentioned at § 506, p 731 G ed. in *iyu*, *iya*. The *n*, then, as semi-vowels are easily interchanged, must be held to be a corruption of *y*. The *i*, however, of *ma*, *mu*, as in the forms in *iu*, plural *i-me* (*myl-i-me*, "we love," §. 506), might correspond to the Sanskrit *y* of the derivative *aya*; so that, e g., the syllable *m* of *sod-m-ti*, "to plant," would be identical with the *i* of the Slavonic *sad-i-ti* of the same meaning, and with the Gothic *i* of *sat-i-ta*, "I placed" (compare § 713). The *n* of the Lithuanian form would then be an inorganic affix, like a rind which has grown upon the vowel termination of the verbal theme, according to the same principle by which, in German, so many nominal bases with an original vowel termination have received the affix of *n*, so that, e g., to the Sanskrit base *vidhavā*, "a widow" (at the same time a nominative, see § 137.), to the Latin *vidua*, and Slavonic *vdova*, a Gothic base *viduvōn* (Nom. *-vō*, § 140.) corresponds, and to the Sanskrit feminine participial bases in *antī* respond Gothic bases in *andern* (Nom. *ander*). If this view be taken, we must then assume that the verbal theme of *sod-i* (Sanskrit *sādaya*), extended to *sod-in*, has taken up the character of the Sanskrit first conjugational Class, and

* See § 20. As regards the transition of the *y* into another liquid, remark the relation of the German *Leber* (labial for guttural, as in Greek *ἡπαρ*, see Graff, II. p 80) to the Sanskrit *yakrit* (from *yakant*) and Latin *jecur*. With respect to the transition of *l* into *n*, observe, e g., the relation of the Doric *ἡνθον* to *ἡλθον*.

has thus entered into the Lithuanian first [G Ed p 10⁹⁸] conjugation thus *sodin-a me** we plant as *suk a me* we turn. In favor of the first mode of explanation might be adduced the circumstance that together with *s-louinu* I praise I extol exists a *s-louinyu*† which latter is clearly identical with the Sanskrit *sṛdayāmi* "I make to hear" and Russian *сладлю sladyú* "I laud." Since in Latin as I think I have clearly proved three conjugations—the first second and fourth—correspond to the Sanskrit tenth Class we have reason to look among these for the Latin causals, as already (p 110) *moneo* has been compared with the Sanskrit *manayāmi* and Prākṛit *mānemi* "I make to think." The causal meaning however is no longer apparent in the Latin *moneo* as it has not any primitive verb corresponding to it from which it might have been derived in a regular way and one as it were often trodden for similar purposes for *memini* may be regarded as a sister form connected with it both in sound and sense but not as the parent of which it is the offspring. *Sedo* which corresponds to the Sanskrit causal *sṛdayāmi* and its German Slavonic sister forms (*sed ā s* = *सिद्ध्यति sidd a(y)a si*) might according to the sense be regarded as the causal of *sedeo* but the latter is in form likewise n causal and there is a want of other analogous cases for the formation of causals [G Ed p 10 9]

* Ruhig doubles the *n* of *laupsinu* in both the plural numbers and in the third person singular of the present and perfect. Mielie on the other hand makes no remark p 98 10 with regard to the necessity of such a reduplication where it does not already occur in the first person singular of the present. For the rest it may be remarked that liquids especially are easily doubled and that *c g* in Sanskrit a final *n* if preceded by a short vowel is doubled in case the word following begins with a vowel.

† The kindred *lausau* "I listen" has like the Creel *κλυω* preserved the original guttural which in *exlauiyu* as in the Sanskrit *sṛi*, has been corrupted to a sibilant.

by the change from the second to the first conjugation. In Latin, therefore, the verbs *sido*, *sedeo*, and *sedo*, can only be regarded as three kindred verbs, which, each in its own way, are referable to the Sanskrit root *sad*. To the Sanskrit *trāsayaṃi*, (Piâkṛit *tāsēmi*), "I make to tremble, to fear," "I terrify," *terreo* by assimilation for *terseo*, from *tiaseo*, corresponds. The fourth conjugation presents *sōpio* as a form finely analogous to the Sanskrit causal *swāpayāmi*, "I make to sleep," (*suapimi*, "I sleep," irregular for *swapmi*), Old Northern *svepum*, "*sopimus*," (singular *svep*), Old High German *in-suepiu*, Russian *усыплайу* *usyplayu** The causal notion, however, is lost in this *sōpio* also, as there is no intransitive *sōpo* of the third conjugation corresponding to it, as a point of departure. The German dialects have, indeed, preserved the primitive (Old High German *slāfu*), but it has become estranged from the causal by the exchange of the semi-vowel *v* for *l* (see § 20). In Russian, on the other hand, *сплю* *splyu*, "I sleep" (euphonic for *spyu*), corresponds, as verb of the Sanskrit fourth Class (see § 500), to the causative *u-syplayu* (*u* preposition), the *y* of which is based on the Sanskrit *u* of contracted forms like *sushu-pīma*, "we slept," *supta*, "having slept," with which, also, may be compared the Greek *ύπ* of *ύπνος*. I here place opposite to one another the corresponding forms of the Latin and Old High German languages for comparison with the Sanskrit *swāpayāmi* and its potential *swāpayé-y-am* (see § 689)

<i>swāp-ayā-mi</i> ,	<i>sōp-ro</i> ,	<i>in-suep-iu</i> .
<i>swāp-aya-si</i> ,	<i>sōp-ī-s</i> ,	<i>in-suep-i-s</i> .
<i>swāp-aya-ti</i> ,	<i>sōp-i-t</i> ,	<i>in-suep-i-t</i> .
<i>swāp-ayā-mas</i> ,	<i>sōp-ī-mus</i> ,	<i>in-suep-ia-m</i> .
<i>swāp-aya-tha</i> ,	<i>sōp-ī-tis</i> ,	<i>in-suep-ia-t</i>
<i>swāp-aya-nti</i> ,	<i>sōp-iu-nt</i> ,	<i>in-suep-ia-nt</i>

* The *l* is only a euphonic affix required by *p ayu* therefore = *ayāmi*

<i>suáp ayé y am</i> *	<i>sóp ia m</i>	<i>in suép ie †</i>	[G Ld p 1030]
<i>suáp-ayé s</i>	<i>sóp ié s †</i>	<i>sóp-iá s</i>	
<i>suáp ayé t</i>	<i>sóp-ic t</i>	<i>sóp ia t</i>	
<i>suáp-ayé^sma</i>	<i>sóp ié-mus</i>	<i>sóp iá mus</i>	
<i>suáp ayé ta</i>	<i>sóp ié tis</i>	<i>sóp iá tis</i>	
<i>suáp ayé y us</i>	<i>sóp ie nt</i>	<i>sóp ia nt</i>	<i>in suép ié n</i>

716 In the Latin first Conjugation which has preserved the two extremes of the Sanskrit causal character *aya* in the contraction *á* the verbs *nectre plátre, laváre* and *clamáre* as well as the above mentioned *sedáre* present themselves as genuine causals both in signification and in origin though they are no longer perceived to be such by the genius of the language since their primitive has either been lost or estranged in form *Nectre* which specially regarded from a Roman point of view must be taken as the denominative of *nex (nec s)* corresponds to the Sanskrit *nás ayá mi perire facio* causal of *nas yá mi, Cl 1 pereo* Another form of *नलसयामि nalsayámi* with softened meaning is *noceo* In Greek *ικνυς* and *ικρως* are to be referred to the Sanskrit root *nas* from *nal* I believe I am right in regarding *ploro* as a corruption of *pláto* for the reason mentioned at § 20 Consequently it corresponds to the Sanskrit *pláyámi* properly I make to flow from the root *plu* to flow which in the Latin *fluo* has experienced an irregular phonetic modification while in *pluit* which belongs to the same root the original tenuis is retained In *lavare* (Greek *λουω*) one of the two [G Ld p 1031] combined initial consonants is lost in other respects however *lavo* corresponds still better than *ploro* to the Sanskrit *plátiayámi* to wash to sprinkle" (in the middle to wash one self) on which also is based the Old High German *fleuu* §

* See § 689

† See §§ 691 697

‡ See § 694

§ This like *lavo* when compared with its intransitive *fluo* estranged from the primitive *fluu u* I flow in that it has kept itself free from the inorganic (ce p 114)

"I wash." In Carniolan *plav-i-m*, "I soak," "I dissolve" (Metelgo, p 115), is the regular causal of *plav-a-m*, "I swim" (= Sanskrit प्लव-अ-मि *plav-â-mi*) *Clamo* properly signifies (if I am right in explaining its *m* as a hardened form of *v* (see p. 121 G ed.), "I make to hear," and possesses, therefore, a concealed affinity to *cluo*, κλύω, and is identical with the Sanskrit *śrāv-ayâ-mi* (ś from *h*), "I make to hear." "I speak," with the Zend *śrāv-ayê-mi* of the same meaning, the Carniolan *slav-i-m*, "I praise," (*sluyem*, "I hear"), the Old Slavonic *словашу* *sloulyû* (of *blagosloulyû*, "I bless"), the Russian *slavlyu*, "I praise," and the Lithuanian *szlôwiyu*, id. (see p 1028 G ed.).

747. Roots, which in Sanskrit end in *â*, or in a diphthong to be changed into *â*, receive before *aya* the affix of a *p*, hence, *e g* *sthâp-ayâ-mi*, "I make to stand," from *sthâ*; *yâp-ayâ-mi*, "I make to go," "I set in motion," from *yâ*. As labials in Latin are not unfrequently replaced by gutturals,* I believe, with Pott (Etymol. F. p 195), that the Latin *facio* should be deduced from *capio*, and be identified with the above-mentioned *yâp-ayâ-mi*; though properly only the *io* of the fourth, and not that of the third Conjugation (= Sanskrit ऋ of the fourth Class), corresponds to the Sanskrit causal character. The agreement of forms like *capio*, *capunt*, *capiam*, &c, and the analogous forms of the fourth

[G Ed p 1032] Conjugation, might, however, easily favor a transition of the latter into the third. The same appears to me to be the case with *facio*, which I compare with the Sanskrit *bhâvayâmi*, "I make to be," "I bring into existence," but in so doing I assume that the *c* is a hardening of the radical *v*† (see § 19), as roots in *â* in the Sanskrit causal never assume a *p*. The Gothic gives us *bau-a*, "I

* Compare, *e g* *quinque* with *pañchan*, πέντε, *coquo* with *pachâmi* πέσσω, Servian *pechem*, "I roast"

† From *û*—for *âû* before vowels *âv*, is the Viddhi form of *û*, see § 29

build (from *bau-ai m*) ns the kindred form to the Sanskrit *bhāv-ayā mi* and Latin *facio* in the second and third persons therefore, the character *ai* of *bau ai s* *bau ai th*, answers to the Sanskrit *aya* of *bhāv-aya si* *bhāv aya ti*. From a German point of view however we could as little perceive the connection between our *bauen* to build and *bin* I am as recognise in Latin the affinity of the roots of *fac-to* and *fu t*. If however I am unable to compare the *c* of the said form with the Sanskrit causal *p* still I think I can shew in Latin one more causal in which *c* takes the place of a Sanskrit *p* viz. *doceo* which I take in the sense of I make to know and regard as akin to *desco* (properly I wish to know) and the Greek *εἰδᾶν διδασκω*. If the *d* of these forms has arisen from *g* (compare *Δημήτηρ* from *Γημήτηρ*) then *doceo* leads to the Sanskrit *jñāp ayāmi* I make to know (*jā nā mi* I know for *jñā nā mi*) and to the Persian *dā na-m* I know. As an example of a Latin causal in which the original *p* has remained unchanged let *rapio* be taken supposing it to correspond to the Sanskrit *rāpayāmi* I make to give * from the root *रā* to give which in my opinion is nothing [G Ed p 1033] but a weakening of *dā*. There also occurs together with *rā* in the Vedic dialect the extended form *rās* just as together with *dā* exists a lengthened form *dās*. In its origin the root *lā* too to which are ascribed the meanings to give and to take appears to be identical with *rā* and *dā*.

748 To the roots which in Sanskrit irregularly annex a *p*

* The derivation (elsewhere admitted as possible) from *lup* (*lump mi*) to give to break to destroy (compare Pott I 208) to which *rumpo* belong is less satisfactory as *a* in this explanation must be taken as the Guna vowel with the loss of the proper vowel of the root. The Latin however avoids the use of Guna and generally retains the radical vowel rather than that of Guna *e g* in *video* which is based on the Sanskrit causal *vidāyāmi* I make to know from the root *vi t*.

in the causal, belongs ἔρειπ , i. e. *ar* (see §. 1.), "to go," whence *ar-p-ayá-mi*, "I move, cast, or send" (*ἰσάν arpayámi*, "*mittas multo*"), with which, perhaps, the Greek $\epsilon\rho\rho\acute{\iota}\pi\omega$ is connected,[†] which, however, as causal, should be $\epsilon\rho\rho\acute{\iota}\pi\acute{\iota}\omega$, or $\epsilon\rho\rho\acute{\iota}\pi\acute{\alpha}\omega$, or $\epsilon\rho\rho\acute{\iota}\pi\acute{\alpha}\zeta\omega$ (see §§. 19. 109. 6). Inasmuch as the theme $\epsilon\rho\rho\acute{\iota}\pi$ has lost the true causal character, this verb has acquired quite the character of a primitive verb, just like $\acute{\iota}\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\omega$, which Pott has referred, in the same way as the previously mentioned Latin *gacio*, to the Sanskrit $\gamma\acute{o}p\text{-}ay\acute{o}\text{-}mi$, "I make to go." If $\rho\acute{\iota}\pi\text{-}\tau\omega$ does not belong to *hship*,[†] "to throw," but, like the others, to *arpayámi*, it is then a transposed form of $\acute{\iota}\rho\pi\text{-}\tau\omega$.

[G Ed p 1034] 749 The Sanskrit root $\text{चिप्र}\acute{\alpha}$, "to sustain," "to rule," assumes, in the causal, *l*, hence *palámyimi*. So, in the Greek $\beta\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\omega$, $\sigma\tau\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\lambda\omega$, $\acute{\iota}\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\omega$, the second λ of which appears to have arisen by assimilation from γ , as $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ from $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ = Gothic *ALYA*, Latin *alius*, Sanskrit *anya-* (see p 401) $\beta\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\omega$, therefore, is for $\beta\acute{\alpha}\lambda\gamma\omega$, from $\beta\acute{\alpha}$ (see p 122 G ed), the radical vowel being shortened ($\beta\acute{\alpha}\lambda\omicron\iota$), which, however, in the transposition $\beta\lambda\eta$ ($\beta\acute{\epsilon}\beta\lambda\eta\text{-}\kappa\alpha$) has preserved its original length,

* Πειπ might be taken as a transposed form of $\epsilon\rho\rho\pi$, and the ϵ as a vowel prefix, as, *e g*, in $\epsilon\lambda\alpha\chi\acute{\iota}\text{-}\varsigma$ = Sanskrit *laghu-*. Observe, also, that the π of $\sigma\acute{\alpha}\lambda\pi\iota\gamma\acute{\epsilon}$, which Sonne (Epilegomena to Benfey's Gr Roots, p 24), identifies with the Sanskrit causal *p*, belongs to a root, which in Sanskrit ends in *ar* (*ri*), viz to *swai* (*swi*), to which Pott also (Et F p 225) has referred it. $\sigma\acute{\alpha}\lambda\pi\iota\gamma\acute{\epsilon}$, therefore, properly = "making to sound." Should, too, the Lith *szwirlpinu*, "I whistle," notwithstanding its *sz* for *s*, belong to this class, then remark the shorter form adduced by Ruhnigk of the 3d persing, *szwirlpiga*, "the bird pipes," where *pia* corresponds to the Sanskrit forms in *payati*, such as *arpayati*, "he makes to go," "he moves."

† The derivation from *hship* pre-supposes an abbreviation of $\rho\acute{\iota}\pi\text{-}\tau\omega$ from $\epsilon\rho\rho\pi\text{-}\tau\omega$, so that *p* would have taken the place of the Sanskrit sibilant, as in $\kappa\rho\epsilon\acute{\iota}\omega\iota\nu$, which Fr Rosen has compared with the Sanskrit root *hshi*, "to rule", see his Rig Vêda Samhita, Annot p 21, where, too, $\kappa\rho\alpha\iota\pi\acute{\nu}\omicron\varsigma$ is compared with *hshipra*, "swift" (from *hship*, "to cast"), and the Latin *crepusculum* with *hshapá*, "night" (better with *hshapas*)

στελλω from στελγω (ἔσταλκα) for σταλγω from στᾶ (ἵσταμι ἵστημι)=Sanskrit *sthā* which in combination with various prepositions assumes the notion of movement* ἰαλλω from ἰαλγω is to be referred in another form as ἰαπτω to the Sanskrit root याγ to go to which also ἴημι belongs as reduplicated form for γιγῆμι (fut ἴσω=ἡμῖν γᾶ γᾶμι compare Lithuanian *yō su* I will ride) Perhaps κελω from κελγω=Sanskrit *chlayāmi*, I move" causal of the root चल् *chal* to move oneself is to be classed here as also παλω from παλγω for παδγω=Sanskrit *pāda yāmi* causal of *pad* to go to the causal of which may be referred also the Latin *pel-lo* as by assimilation from *pel-vo* All these forms therefore if our explanation of them be correct have lost the initial *a* of the Sanskrit causal character *aya* of the special tenses and are hereby removed as it were from the Sanskrit tenth Class into the fourth (compare Pott II 15) As in Greek verbs in *εω αω* (for *εγω αγω*) *αζω* are the proper representatives of the Sanskrit causal form or tenth Class and as these extend their class [G I d p 103] character also over the present and imperfect so here too *καλεω* may be considered as a constricted causal which like the Latin *clamo* properly signifies to make to hear and answers to the Sanskrit *śrīṣayāmi* (s from l) Accordingly I take *καλεω* as a transposition of *κλαεω* for *κλαεω*

750 The Zend it appears has no part in the use of the *p* which, according to § 717 is in the causal to be added to roots in *d* at least I know of no example where it is found on the other hand we find evidence of the discontinuance of the addition of a *p* in *𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬀* *āstāya* make to come being (Vend S p 55 several times)=

* Observe also that together with *sthā* there exists a root *sthal* and with *pā* a root *pal* To *sthal* belong our *stille* place Old High German *stellu* from *stelyu* properly I make to stand =Sanskrit *sthalayāmi*

* See 'The Caucasian members of the Indo-European family of languages'

* See 'The Caucasian members of the Indo-European family of languages'

prise us as in Latin also and German the form of the Sanskrit causals or tenth Class is so prevalent as to extend over three Conjugations in Latin and the three Classes of the weak Conjugation in the German dialects (see § 109 6)

DESIDERATIVES

751 We now betake ourselves to the examination of the Sanskrit desideratives which as has been already elsewhere remarked* are retained also in Greek if not in signification at least in form in verbs like βιβρωσκω γιγνωσκω μιμησκω διδασκω διδρασκω τιτρωσκω πιτισκω πιπρασκω πιφανσκω where the guttural is most probably as in ἔσκει and the Old Latin future *escit* only a euphonic accompaniment of the sibilant which in all Sanskrit desideratives is appended to the root either directly or by means of a vowel of conjunction : The roots beginning with a vowel repeat the entire root according to the principle of the seventh root formation (§ 582) e g *āsis i sh*† to wish to sit as a weakened form of *āsisish* [G Ed p 1037] *arish* to wish to go for *ararish* from अर *ar* (अृ *ri*) So in Greek *απαρισκω* Roots which begin with a consonant repeat it or its euphonic representative with the radical vowel where however a long vowel is shortened and the heaviest vowel *a* weakened to *i* (see § 6) ‡ according to the same principle by which in Latin the *a* especially is excluded from syllables of repetition (see § 583) On this account the *i* prevails in the reduplicated syllables of desideratives and the agreement

* Annals of Oriental Literature (London 1860) p 65

† The appended sibilant is originally the dental (म् *s*) but according to § 21 subjected to a mutation into *sh*

Though roots with *ri* in their middle receive an *i* in the repeated syllables still this is based on the original form *ar*

with the kindred forms in Greek is thus the more striking. We find, indeed, *e.g.*, *yuyutsāmi*, "I wish to contend" (R. *yudh*), *bubhūshāmi*, "I wish to adorn" (R. *bhāsh*), but not *ḡaḡa-dishāmi*, but *ḡaḡadishāmi*, "I wish to speak", not *ḡaḡñāśāmi*, but *ḡaḡñāśāmi* Mid. *ḡaḡñāśē*, "I wish to know, to learn, or to inquire" To *ḡaḡñāśāmi* the Greek *γῑγνώσκω*, and Latin (*g*)*no-sco*, correspond in form, which latter, like all similar Latin formations, has lost the reduplication. To *mimnāśāmi*, desiderative of *mñāś* (*memorare, nunciare, laudare*), *μῑμνήσκω*, and the Latin *reminiscor*, correspond. In the special tenses the Sanskrit places an *a* by the side of the desiderative sibilant, which, according to the analogy of the *a* of the first and sixth Classes, is liable, in the first person, to be lengthened (see § 434.), and also in Greek and Latin, in the same way as the said class-vowel is

[G Ed p 1038] represented (see §. 109^{n.1}). I give, for comparison, the present and imperfect active of *ḡaḡñāśāmi* over against the corresponding forms of Greek and Latin

PRESENT			
	SANSKRIT	GREEK	LATIN
Sing.	<i>ḡaḡñā-sā-mi</i> ,	<i>γῑγνώ-σκω</i> ,	<i>no-sco</i> .
	<i>ḡaḡñā-sa-si</i> ,	<i>γῑγνώ-σκει-ς</i> ,	<i>no-sci-s</i> .
	<i>ḡaḡñā-sa-ti</i> ,	<i>γῑγνώ-σκει</i> ,	<i>no-sci-t</i>
Du	<i>ḡaḡñā-sā-vas</i>	. .	.
	<i>ḡaḡñā-sa-thas</i> ,	<i>γῑγνώ-σκε-τον</i>	. .
	<i>ḡaḡñā-sa-tas</i> ,	<i>γῑγνώ-σκε-τον</i>
Plur.	<i>ḡaḡñā-sā-mas</i> ,	<i>γῑγνώ-σκο-μες</i> ,	<i>no-sci-mus</i> .
	<i>ḡaḡñā-sa-tha</i> ,	<i>γῑγνώ-σκε-τε</i> ,	<i>no-sci-tis</i>
	<i>ḡaḡñā-sa-nti</i> ,	<i>γῑγνώ-σκο-ντι</i> ,	<i>no-scu-nt</i>

* Clearly only a transposed form of *man*, "to think," with the radical vowel lengthened, as, *e g*, in Greek, *βέβληκα* from *βαλ*, *πέπτωκα* from *πετ*

IMPERFECT

	SANSKRIT	GREEK	LATIN
Sing	अजिह्वा सा म	εγιγω-σκο-ν	
	अजिह्वा-सा स	εγιγνω σκε ς	
	अजिह्वा सा त	εγιγω σκε	
Du	अजिह्वा सौ वा		
	अजिह्वा सा ताम	εμιγω-σκε τον	
	अजिह्वा सा ताम	εγιγνω σκε την	
Plur	अजिह्वा सौ मा	εγιγω σको-μεν	
	अजिह्वा सा ता	εγιγνω σκε τε	
	अजिह्वा सा न	εμιγω σको ι	

In the general tenses Sanskrit desideratives lay aside only the vowel *a* appended to the sibilant while in Greek and Latin the whole formation *εγ* [G Ed p 1039] tends only to the special tenses and *εγ* *μιω* *σω* springs from the simple unreduplicated root and hence stands in no closer analogy to the Sanskrit *जिह्वा* *ι* *σχυάμι*. That in Latin the future *noscā* departs from the Greek arises from this—that the future of the third and fourth conjugations according to its origin is only a mood of the present and hence *εγ* *noscēs* corresponds to the Sanskrit *जिह्वासे* and Greek *εγιγνωσकोις*.

752 It may reasonably be conjectured that the desiderative form is no stranger in Zend but I am unable to furnish satisfactory examples. Perhaps the forms *𐬨𐬀𐬯𐬭𐬀𐬵𐬀𐬰𐬭𐬀* *peresanuha* and *𐬨𐬀𐬯𐬭𐬀𐬵𐬀𐬰𐬭𐬀* *peresduti* in the fifteenth Fargard of the Vend (Vend S p 131 Anq p 393) are to be classed under this head. The first mentioned form which Anquetil translates *est volante* is evidently like the *𐬨𐬀𐬯𐬭𐬀𐬵𐬀𐬰𐬭𐬀* *peresanuha* ask which follows it an imperative middle and *𐬨𐬀𐬯𐬭𐬀𐬵𐬀𐬰𐬭𐬀* *peresduti* which Anquetil renders *on s'approche* is like the succeeding *𐬨𐬀𐬯𐬭𐬀𐬵𐬀𐬰𐬭𐬀* *peresduti* interroget the 3d per sing of the subjunctive active. Perhaps *𐬨𐬀𐬯𐬭𐬀𐬵𐬀𐬰𐬭𐬀* *peresanuha* may correspond to the Sanskrit *जिह्वासु* inform thyself

and *յրաւասցալլ յրսմի* be based on a to-be-presupposed Lêt-form *հիսիմի յրնմսմի*? I will not venture to decide this point, any more than to pronounce on the forms which occur in the same page of the Vend. S., *այնչասցնալլ* *mmanēsanuha*, and *յրաւասցնալլ* *mmanīcsāti*, which likewise have the appearance of desideratives. As regards the origin of the desiderative character *s*, it probably springs, like the *s* of the auxiliary future and of the aorist of primitive verbs, from the root *as* of the verb substantive. Compare, *e. g.*, *diduk-shamī*, "I wish to shew," with *dēk-ṣhyāmī*, "I will shew,"

[G Ed p 1040] and *adiduk-sham*, "I wished to shew," with the aorist *aduk-sham*, and the imperatives of the aorist mentioned above (§. 727.) like *bhūsha*, *nēshatu*.

INTENSIVES

753. Besides desideratives, there is in Sanskrit another class of derivative verbs, which receive a reduplication, viz. intensives. These require a great emphasis on the syllable of reduplication, and hence increase the vowels capable of Guna, even the long ones, by Guna, and lengthen *a* to *ā*, *e. g.* *vēvēśmī* (or *vēvisīmi*), plural *vēviśmas*,* from *viś*, "to enter," *dēdīpmī* (or *dēdīpīmi*) from *dīp*, "to shine," *lōlōpmī* (or *lōlupīmi*) from *lup*, "to cut off," *bōbhūśhmī* (or *bōbhūshīmi*) from *bhūśh*, "to adorn," *śāśakmī* (or *śāśukīmi*), from *śak*, "to be able." As in Greek ω is a very frequent representative of long α (see §. 4), so, as has been elsewhere remarked, (Glossarium Sanskr. a. 1830, p. 113), $\tau\omega\theta\acute{\alpha}\zeta\omega$ has quite the build of a Sanskrit intensive, only that it is introduced into the ω conjugation. In $\pi\alpha\iota\pi\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\omega$, $\delta\alpha\iota\delta\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\omega$,

* After the analogy of verbs of the third Class, regard being had to the weight of the personal terminations (see § 486) To the light terminations, beginning with a consonant, *i* may be prefixed as conjunctive vowel, when, however, the Guna of the base syllable is dropped, hence, *e. g.* *vēvisīmi*

παιφασσω μαιμαζω μαιμασσω the insertion of η in the syllable of repetition supplies the place of the lengthening of the fundamental vowel, so in ποιπιυω (R τιυ πνεω from πνεω fut πιευσω) μοιμναω μοιμυλλω where the υ of the root is in the syllable of repetition replaced by ο since υ does not form a convenient diphthong. On this analogy rest also δοιδυξ and κοικυλλω.

754 Roots beginning with a vowel of [G Ed p 1041] which only a few possess an intensive repeat the whole root twice in such a manner that the radical *a* is lengthened in the second place, hence *atāt* from *at* to go *asās* from *as* to eat. I believe I recognise a clear counterpart to these intensive bases in the Greek *αγωγ* though this forms no verb but only some nominal forms as *αγωγος αγωγευς*. The case of the ω for ā is just the same as in the above-mentioned *τωθαζω*. On the other hand in *οινημι οστιπτευω ατιταλλω* the base syllable has experienced a weakening of the vowel like that which enters into Sanskrit desideratives (§ 751 p 1037 G ed) which does not however prevent me from referring these forms according to their origin rather to intensives than to desideratives (compare Pott II p 75) so also *αλαλαζω* and *ελελιζω* which exhibit the same weight of vowel in the base and in the syllable of repetition.

755 Roots also which begin with a consonant and end with a nasal in case they have *a* as the base vowel repeat the whole root twice in the Sanskrit intensive but lengthen the radical vowel neither in the syllable of repetition nor in that of the base. The nasal in accordance with a universal rule of sound is influenced in the former syllable so as to conform itself to the organ of the following consonant and in roots which begin with two consonants only one enters into the syllable of repetition hence *e g dan-dram* from *dram* to run *bambhram* from *bhram* to wander about *ἡᾱᾱ jangam* from *gam* to go. So in Greek *παμφαινω* from *φαινω* the *v* of which though not be-

longing to the root, is nevertheless reflected in the syllable of repetition (see §. 598) On जङ्ग *jangam* is based, I believe, the Gothic *gagga* (i e *ganga*, see §. 86. 1), so that therefore *gam*, in the syllable of the root, has lost the termination *am**, and *gagg* has entirely assumed the character [G Ed p. 1042] of a root, which in High German has produced a new reduplication (Old High German, *giang* from *gigang*, our *gieng*, see § 592.). And in the formation of the word, *gang* holds as an independent root, whence, in Gothic, *gah-ts†*, “gait” (*inna-gah-ts*, *fram-gah-ts*) The Lithuanian presents *ženqu* “I step,” as analogous form ‡.

756 Some Sanskrit roots also, which do not end in a nasal in the intensive, introduce a nasal into the syllable of reduplication, e g., *chañchal* (or *chāchal*) from *chal*, “to move oneself,” *pamphul* from *phal*, “to burst,” with the weakening of the *a* to *u* in the base syllable; so *chuñchur* from *char*, “to go” As liquids are easily interchanged, it may be assumed that here the nasal of the repeated syllable is only a changed form of the radical liquid *l* or *r*. So in many Greek reduplicated forms, as, *πίμπλημι*, *πίμπρημι*, *γίγ-γραινῶ*, *γίγγλυμος*, *γαγγαλίζω*, *γάγγραινα*, *τονθορίζω*, *τανταλεύω*, *τενθρηδών*, *πεμφρηδών*. The following are examples in which the liquids remain unchanged in the syllable of reduplication *μαρμαίρω*, *μορμύρω*, *μέρμερος*, *μερμαίρω*, *μερμηρίζω*, *καρκαίρω*, *γαργαίρω*, *βορβορίζω*, *πορφύρα*, *πορφύρω* Compare with these the intensives of those Sanskrit roots in *ar* which contract this syllable in the weakened forms to अ *ri* these, in the active of the intensive, repeat the whole root twice, except when this begins with two consonants, in

* The final *a* is the class syllable, 3d per pl *gagg-a-nd*

† Euphonic for *gag-ts*, the nasal being rejected With respect to the suffix, compare the Sanskrit *ga-ti-s*, “gait,” for *gan-ti-s*, see § 91

‡ In Lithuanian *z* often stands for the Sanskrit *g* or *j* Compare, e g., *žadas*, “speech,” with the Sanskrit *gad*, “to speak”

[G Ed p 1044] 758. The intensive forms *pan-î-pad* and *pan-î-pat*, from *pad*, "to go," and *pat*, "to fall" (Pân. VII 4. 81), appear obscure. In explanation of these it may be assumed, that together with पद् *pad* and पत *pat* there have existed also the nasalized forms *pand* and *pant*, as together with many other roots which terminate in a simple mute there exist also those which have likewise prefixed to their mute the nasal corresponding to their organ, as, *e g*, *panth* with *path*, "to go." Together with *dah*, "to burn," exists also a root दह् *danh*; and hence may be deduced the intensive form *dandah* (Pân VII. 4. 86), to which the Gothic *tandya*, "I kindle" (with the causal character *ya*, see § 741), has the same relation, as above (p 1011 G. ed.) *gagga* = *ganga*, "I go," to *jangam* †

[G Ed p 1045] 759 In Latin, *gingrio* has the appearance of a Sanskrit intensive, and is by Pott also (II. 75) referred to this

* With *panth* are connected the strong cases of *pathm*, "way," as also the Latin *pons*, *pont-is*, as "way over a river," and the Slavonic *пѣтъ* *púty*, "way" (see § 225^b) with *path* is connected, amongst other words, the Greek *πάρος* (see Glossarium Sanskr a 1847, p. 206)

† With regard to the *t* for *d* of *tandya*, see § 87. The retention of the second *d* of the Sanskrit form *dandah* is to be ascribed to the influence of the *n* preceding it (compare § 90). Remark, also, the form *sandya*, "I send," in which I think I recognise the causal of the Sanskrit root *sad*, "to go," (*sádayámi*, "I make to go,") with a nasal inserted. Graff sets up (IV p 685) for the Old High German a root *zand* (*z* for Gothic *t*, and *t* for *d*, according to § 87), which he likewise endeavors to compare with the Sanskrit *dah*, but without finding any information as to the *n* and *t* through the intensive form ददह् *dandah*. On the primitive root *dah*, if not on the causal form *dāhay*, is based also the Old High German *dāh-t* or *tāh-t* (our *Docht*, *Dacht*), which by more exact retention of the radical consonants is completely estranged from the intensives (in meaning causals) *zand* or *zant*. Initial Medials frequently remain in German unaltered, *e g*, in the above-mentioned *gagga*, "I go," = *jangam*, while the Gothic root *qvam*, "to come" (*qvima*, *qvam*), which is based on the primitive *gam*, has experienced the regular change of Medials to Tonues

class and radically compared with *grī* 1 c *gar gir* (whence *gir* voice) The syllable of reduplication exhibits *n* for *r* as in the Sanskrit *chañchur* and similar Greek forms (§ 756) To *girdmi* (also *gilumi*) *deglutio* belong amongst other words the Latin *gula* and *gurgulio* which latter in its reduplicated syllable replaces the liquid *l* by *r*

760 The passive form of the Sanskrit intensive has usually an active meaning and then by Indian Grammarians is regarded according to its formation not as passive but as a particular form of the intensive which I nevertheless call deponent as in its origin it is evidently nothing else than passive This appears more frequently in classical Sanskrit as the form without *ya* yet still seldom enough I know of no examples besides चञ्चुर्यन्ते *chañchuryantē* they convey (Mah I 7910) from चर *char* (see § 756) ललियसे *lālihyase* thou lickest from लल *lāl* (Bhagavad G 11 30) ददप्यमाना *dādpyamāna* shining from दप *dāp* (Nal 3 1 Drup 2 1) In ददलप्यमाना (1 c) from दल or *dhu* the passive form has also a passive signification Of the form without *ya* there occurs the participle present ललित *lālita* Mid *lālīhāna* licking Mah III 10391 12240 The Veda dialect makes more frequent use of the active form of the intensive the following are examples ननदति *nānadati* they sound * Rig V I 61 8 11 *abhipra nonumas* we praise from *nu* (prep *abhi pra* 1 c 78 1) जधामि *jāhami* I summon with *a* as vowel of conjunction (see p 1010 G ed Note) from *hu* as contracted form of *hū* 1 c 31 12 [G Ld p 1016] अनमत *ānāmōt* he moved he stirred from *nud* to move to drive (prep *a*) Rig V †

* All reduplicated forms which combine the personal terminations direct with the root suppress the *n* of the 3d per pl (compare § 400) To the root *nad* the Welch *nādu* to cry corresponds

† See Westerg., Radices p 45 R *nu* to which likewise, *ānāmōt* according to its form might belong the meaning however in the pas

DENOMINATIVES

761 Denominatives are not so frequently used in Sanskrit as in the kindred languages of Europe. Their formation is effected either by the addition of the character of the 10th Class, or by the affixes *ya*, *śya*, and *asya*, both which latter ought probably to be divided into *s-ya* and *as-ya*, so that in them the root of the verb substantive *as* is contained, either entire or after dropping the vowel (compare § 618.) As the Latin verbs of the 1st, 2d, and 4th conjugations are based on the Sanskrit 10th Class (§ 109^a 6), forms like *laud-â-s*,[†] *nomm-â-s*, *lu-min-â-s*, *color-â-s*, *fluctu-â-s*, *æstu-â-s*, *domin-â-s*, *regn-â-s*, *sorori-â-s*, *cœn-â-s*, *plant-â-s*, *pisc-â-ris*, *alb-â-s*, *calv-â-s*, *can-â-s*, *miser-*

[G Ed p 1047] *-â-ris*, *feroc-â-s*, *lasciv-â-s*, *lipp-â-s*, *abort-â-s*, *fin-â-s*, *sit-â-s*, correspond to Sanskrit forms such as *kumâr-aya-si*, “thou playest,” from *kumâra*, “a boy†,” *sukh-aya-si*,



sage cited leads to the root *nud* the *t*, therefore, of the form in question is not a sign of the person, but radical (euphon for *d*), since the personal character of the 2d and 3d pers sing of the imperf, according to § 94, cannot combine with roots ending in a consonant, hence, *e g*, *ayunah*, “thou didst bind,” and “he bound,” for *ayunah-sh*, *ayunah-t* (see smaller Sanskrit Grammar, § 289) With respect to the syllable of reduplication, the form *â-nav-î-nût* for *ânônôt* is remarkable on account of the insertion of an *î*, as, according to grammatical rules, such an insertion occurs only after *r* and *n*, see § 757, and smaller Sanskrit Grammar, §§ 500 501 508

* I give the 2d pers, as the 1st exhibits the conjugational character less plainly, and presents the least resemblance to the other persons

† From *sororius*, not from *sonor*, for from the latter would have come *sonoro*, not *sororo*

‡ The Indian Grammarians wrongly exhibit a root *kumâr*, “to play”—which, if only for the number of syllables, is suspicious—and thence derive *kumâra*, “a boy,” in which I recognise the prefix *ku*, which usually expresses “contempt,” but here “diminution,” and *mâra*, which does not occur by itself, but is connected with *mar tyā*, “man,” as “mortal” In general there occur, among the roots exhibited by Indian Grammarians,

many

thou rejoicest from *sukha* contentment *yól tr aya si*
 thou enirclest from *yóktṛa*, band (*R yuj* to bind)
lśham -aya si thou supportest from *lśhamá* patience
 From these examples we see that in Sanskrit also the
 final vowel of the base word is rejected before the verbal
 character for otherwise *e g* from *yól tr aya si* would
 come *yóktṛáya si*. That in Latin forms like *coen á s* the
á does not belong to the base noun is seen from this that
 the final vowel of bases of the second declension is rejected
 before the verbal derivatives *á é* and *í* hence *regn á s*
calé é s lasciv í s. As to the retention however of the
 organic *u* viz that of the fourth declension before *á* (*aestu*
u s fluctu á s) I would remark that in Sanskrit also *u* shews
 itself to be a very firm vowel inasmuch as it maintains
 itself before the vowels of nominal derivative suffixes and
 indeed it moreover receives the Guna increment while *a*
 and *i é* the heaviest and lightest vowel are dropped
 hence *e g mánava s* man (as descendant of *Manu*) from
manu, *शीघ्रम् sáuch a m* purity from *शुचि suchi* pure,
dásarath í s Son of Dasaratha from *dasaratha*. Before *i*
 however in Latin the *u* of the fourth de [G Ed p 1048]
 clension disappears in denominative verbs as in the above
 mentioned *abort í s*.

762 As a consequence of what has been said in the pre-
 ceding paragraph I believe that a suppression of the vowel
 of the base noun is also to be assumed in Greek denomina-
 tives in *aw ew ow áζω íζω*. I therefore divide *e g* *αγορ*
*άζω * αγορ αο μαι μορφ ow κνισσ ow πολεμ ow πολεμ ew*

many denominatives amongst them also *sukh* to rejoice which con-
 tains the prefix *su* (Gr *ew*) as certainly as *दुःख duhkhh* *dolore afficere*
 (from *duhkha* smart) contains the prefix *du*=Greek *δ s*. By the
 Indian Grammarians however *duhkhh* likewise is considered as a simple
 root

* I have already in § 507 pointed out another mode of viewing the
 forms in *ζω* and *ίζω* but in § 503 I have given the preference to the

πολεμ'-ίζω, and recognise in the σ of αζω the Sanskrit a of *ayā-mi*, and in the ζ the corruption of $\chi \gamma$, as in ζεύγνυμι compared with the Sanskrit $\chi \gamma$ and Latin *jungo* (see § 19), while in forms in αω, ωω, οω, the semi-vowel is suppressed, and, moreover, in the two last forms the very common corruption from α to e , o has taken place (§ 3). It admits of scarce any doubt that in forms in ιζω also the i is only a weakening of σ , for though the weakening of a to i is not so frequent in Greek as in Latin and Gothic, still it is by no means unprecedented, and occurs, to quote a case tolerably similar to the one before us, in ιζω, ιζομαι, compared with the Sanskrit root *sad*, "to seat oneself," Gothic *SAT* (*sita*, *sat*).

763 The lightness of the vowel i may be the reason why the form in ιζω has become more used than that in σζω, and that those bases, which experience no abbreviation before the denominative derivative element by the relinquishment of their final

[G Ed p 1049] letter, admit scarce any letter but i before ζ , hence, $e g$, ποδ'-ίζω, ἄγωνι-ίζομαι, ἄκοντ-ίζω, ἀνδρ-ίζω, αἵματ-ίζω, ἄλοκ-ίζω, γυναικ-ίζω, θωρακ-ίζω, κυν-ίζω, μυωπ-ίζω, κρατ-ίζω, κερματ-ίζω, ἐρματ-ίζω, but ἐρμ'-άζω, ὀνορι'-άζω, γουιν'-άζομαι,* which, I think, ought not to be divided ἐρμά-ζω, ὀνομά-ζω, easy though it be, from the point of view of the Greek in particular, to identify the α of ἐρμάζω, ὀνομάζω, ἀγοράζω, ἀγοράομαι, and the like, with the α of the base-noun. For then the analogy of these verbs with such as ἵππ'-άζομαι, λιθ'-άζω, εἰκ'-άζω (from the base εἶκοτ), ἐνδι'-άω, γενει'-άω, πελκε'-άω, νεμεσ'-άω, and with the Sanskrit denominatives in *aya*, would be unnecessarily destroyed, for as o and η , and occasionally

above, and do so now with the greater confidence, as the other members also of our family of languages, the denominatives of which I had not then considered, follow the same principle

* Not from γουιν, but from the base γουνατ, whence γούνατ-ος, γούνατ-α

υ and *ι* are dropped before the derivative *αω αζω** there is nothing more natural than that *α* also should give way before the same. But as bases in *α* and *η* (from *ᾱ* see § 4) produce principally denominatives in *αω αζω* and those in *ο* principally such as end in *οω ιζω* from this the influence of the final vowel of the base noun on the choice of the vowel of the derivative may be inferred, *α* and *η* favor the retention of the original *α* while *ο* which is itself a corruption of *α* readily permits the *α* of the derivative to be weakened to *ο* in which it seems to re appear unchanged but which (if we wish to allow in its full extent the transmission of apparently *ι* to *ι*thionic Greek forms from the time of the unity of language) presents no obstacle to our placing on the same footing as regards their principle of formation verbs like *πολεμ(ο) οω χρυσ(ο) οω αγκυλ(ο) οω* and such as *αιματ οω αρρεν οω πυρ οω κατοφρυ οω θαλασσ(α) οω κνισσ(α) οω* and to our recognising such verbs as *αγορ(α) αομαι πολμ(α) αω διψ(α) αω νικ(η) αω* as analogous with [G Ed p 1050] such as *κυν αω γενει(ο) αω λοχ(ο) αω αντι(ο) αω νεμεσ(ι) αω πελεκ(υ) αω*. The proposition appears to me incontrovertible that the Greek denominatives in *αζω αω εω οω ιζω* correspond to the Sanskrit in *ayā* (1st per *ayā-mi* Zend *aye mi*) and that as in Sanskrit Zend and Latin so also in Greek the final vowel of the theme of the base noun is for the most part suppressed before the vowel of the derivative † where however it is retained which is only at times the case with *ι* and *υ* the vowel of the verbal derivative also remains after it (*δηρι αομαι οφρυ οω ιχθυ αω*). Forms like *δηρι ομαι μητι ομαι μητι ω μεθυ ω δακρυ ω* belong to another class of denominatives which exists also in Sanskrit of which hereafter

764 In German also the final vowels of nominal bases

* Examples in which *α* and *υ* are retained are *λαυσι αω ρ αω δηρ αομαι χθ αω*

† G Curtius is of a different opinion (*Contributions to the Comparison of Language* pp 119 120)

are suppressed before the vowel or *y* (for *ay*) of the verbal derivative, which is based on the Sanskrit *aya*, hence, in Gothic *audag'-ya*, "I account happy," from the base *audaga* (nom. *audag'-s*, see §. 135), "happy," *gaur'-ya*, "I sadden," from *gaura*, nom. *gaur'-s*, "sad," *skaft'-ya*, "I make," from *skaftu*, "creation," nom. *skaft'-s*,^{*} *manv'-ya*, "I prepare," from *manvu*, nom. *manvu-s*, "ready," *maurthr'-ya*, "I murder," from *maurthia*, nom. *maurthi* (see § 153), "murder,"† *tagr'-ya*, "I weep," from *tagra*, nom. *tagr'-s*, "a tear," (Greek *δάκρυ*, Sanskrit *asru*, from *dasru*) Among those Gothic

[G Ed p 1051] denominatives which have retained in the present the last syllable of the Sanskrit derivative *aya*, the verb *ufårskadv-ya*, "I overshadow," stands alone, since this verb has retained the final vowel of the base *skadu* (nom. -*us*) before the verbal derivative (with euphonic change into *v*), while other bases in *u* follow the general principle, hence, *thaur's'-yan*, "to thirst" (impers. *thausyith mik*, "I thirst," literally, "it thirsteth me,") from *thaursu* (nom. -*us*), "düy," *dauth'-ya*, "I slay," from *dau-thu-s*, "death,"‡ as in Greek, *θανατ'-όω*, from *θανατο* The following are derivatives to be classed here, and springing from bases ending in a consonant *namn-ya*, "I name," from *naman* (nom. *namó*, see § 141), and *aug'-ya*, "I shew," from *augan* (nom. *augó*), "an eye" The former, like the Latin *nomin-o*, and Greek forms like *αἰματ'-όω*, *αἰματ'-ίζω*, has preserved the final consonant of the base, but has, however, admitted an internal abbreviation, like that of the Sanskrit weakest

* This does not occur in the simple form, but compounded *ga-skaft'-s*, "creation," "creature," *ufar-skaft'-s*, "commencement"

† Compare Sanskrit *már-ayámi*, "I make to die," the Gothic suffix *thia*=Sanskrit *tra*, of which hereafter

‡ Scarcely from *dauth(a)s*, "dead," for the Old High German *tódu* clearly comes from *tód* (theme *tóda*), "death," not from *tót* (nom. masc *tótér*), "dead"

case (*nāmn aṣ nōminis*) on the other hand *aug ya* (for *augan ya* or *augia ya*) follows the principle already mentioned in § 503 by which Sanskrit denominatives are governed such as *īarm ayā mi* I harness for *īarman ayā mi* from *īarman*. Compare besides the Greek formations discussed *l c* derivatives also from comparatives, as *βελτι(οι)-οω μει(οι)-οω ελασσ(οι)-οω κακι(οι) οω**. In Greek also bases in *Σ* reject their final consonant together with the vowel preceding it which is the less surprising as this class of words has in the declension too preserved but few traces of the *σ* of the base (see § 128). Hence *ε γ πληρ (εσ) οω* from *πληρες* (see § 146) *α λ γ (εσ) εω* from *α λ γ ες* *α σ θ ει (εσ) εω* from *α σ θ ει ες* *τ ευ χ (εσ) ι ζ ω* [G Ed p 105] from *τ ευ χ ες* *γ η ρ (α σ) αω* from *γ η ρ ας* (§ 128).

765 We return to the Gothic in order to adduce some denominatives from Grimm's second and third conjugations of weak verbs. The second conjugation which exhibits *δ = d* (§ 69) for the Sanskrit *aya* and has therefore like the Latin first rejected the *ay* of *aya* and then contracted into one long vowel the vowels which by the loss of the *y* touch one another yields *ε γ fisk θ s* thou fiskest for comparison with the Latin *pisc -d ris*. The Gothic base *fiska* (nom *fisk -s* see § 135) has abandoned its *a* as the Latin *pisci* its *i* before the vowel of the derivative (see § 761 p 1016 G ed). The Gothic *thiudan θ s* thou reignest from the base *thiudana* (nom *-n s*) *king* resembles in its principle of formation the Latin *domin d s* as the Gothic first strong declension masculine and neuter and the Latin second on one side and the Gothic second weak conjugation and the Latin first on the other side are in their origin fully identical. To Latin denominatives from the first declension like *cæn -d s* (see § 761) correspond Gothic

* On the other hand *π λ ο ν ζ ω* not *π λ ε α ζ ω*

verbs of the same class, as, *faun'-ô-s*, "thou blamest," from the base *faunô* (nom *-na*), "blame" To *aestu-ô-s*, *fluctu-ô-s*, corresponds *lust'-ô-s*, from the base *lusty*, "desire," "longing," with the rejection of the *u*, however, of the nominal base Bases in *an* weaken their *a* to *i*, as in the genitive and dative, hence, *frauyin-ô-s*, "thou reignest," from *frauyan*, "lord" (nom *frauya*, gen. *frauyin-s*), as in Latin, *nomin-ô-s*, *lumin-ô-s* (§. 761.); so *gudyn-ô-s*, "thou administertest the priest's office," from *gudyan*, nom. *gudya*, "priest." Some bases terminating in *a* add *n* before the formation of a denominative, and likewise weaken the *a* of the base to *i*, thus, *skalkin-ô-s*, "thou servest," from *skalka*, nom. *skalk'-s*, "servant," gen. *skalki-s* (see § 191.), *hórin-ô-s*, *μοιχεύεις*, from *hóra*, nom. *hoi'-s*, "adulterer," *reikin-ô-s*, "thou rulest," from *reikya*, nom. *reiki* (see § 153), "king-

[G Ed p 1053] dom" That class of weak verbs which has contracted the Sanskrit *aya* to *ai*, and stands on the same footing with the Latin second conjugation (Grimm's third weak conjugation), presents, e g., *arm'-ai-s*, "thou commiseratest," from *arma*, nom. *arm-s*, as, in Latin, *miser'-ê-ris* from *miseru* (*miser* for *miseru-s*), *ga-hveil'-ai-s* "thou tarigest," from *hveilô*, nom. "hveila," "time," "delay."

766 The Slavonic uses, likewise, for the formation of denominatives, that conjugational form which corresponds to the Sanskrit tenth Class But, as has been remarked in § 505., not only Dobrowsky's third conjugation belongs to the Sanskrit verbal class just mentioned, but also the greater portion of those verbs which, in § 500, I wrongly classed all, without exception, under the Sanskrit fourth Class, whilst I can now recognise as sister forms of the Sanskrit fourth Class, of Latin verbs like *capiô*, and Gothic like *vahs-ya*, "I grow," only such verbs of Dobrowsky's first conjugation as combine the formative elements commencing with a consonant, for example, the *ch* of the preterite, the *l* and *v* of the participle preterite active, and of the

gerundive preterite as also the suffixes *ти ti* and *тъ t* of the infinitive and supine direct with the root a circumstance which occurs only with respect to a few roots terminating in a vowel *e g* from *ну to drink* (Sanskrit *pi* Class 4 middle) comes *пи̃ pi yû* "I drink" (Sanskrit *pi ya*) *пи̃ши pi ye shi* "thou drinkest" (Sanskrit *pi ya si*) *пи̃чи pi chi* "I drank, *пи̃лъ pi l* having drunk *пи̃и pi i* (gerundive), *пи̃ти pi ti* to drink sup *пи̃тъ pi t* Those verbs however in *лѣ yû* or *лѣ̃ ayû* which in the said forms interpose an *a* between the root or the verbal theme and the formative element which follows (Paradigm B of Dobrowsky) I am now of opinion must be compared with the Sanskrit tenth Class so that *yû* and more fully *ayû* of the 1st person corresponds to the Sanskrit *ayâ mi* and the Lithuanian *ayũ ayũ iyũ* (see § 306 p 731 [C Ld p 1054] G ed) Compare *e g* *ры̃д-ayũ* I lament with the Sanskrit *raudâ raudâ yâmi* "I make to weep" (R *rud* to weep) and the Lithuanian *raud-ayũ* * "I lament

SINGULAR

SAN KRIT	OLD SLAVONIC.	LITHUANIAN
<i>rod̃ aya-mi</i>	<i>ryd̃ ayû</i>	<i>raud-ayũ</i>
<i>rod̃ aya si</i>	<i>ryd̃ aye shi</i>	<i>raud̃ iyũ</i>
<i>rod̃ aya ti</i>	<i>ryd̃ aye ty</i>	<i>raud̃ oyũ</i>

DUAL

<i>rod̃ aya ias</i>	<i>ryd̃ aye ia</i>	<i>raud̃ aya uo</i>
<i>rod̃ aya thas</i>	<i>ryd̃ aye ta</i>	<i>raud̃ iyũ ta</i>
<i>rod̃ aya tas</i>	<i>ryd̃ aye-ta</i>	<i>raud̃ oya</i>

* As the Sanskrit *ô* is a contraction of *au* so in this respect the Lithuanian form corresponds still more than the Slavonic to the Sanskrit *causal*. The Slavonic *ѣ y* corresponds (according to § 25 c) to the Sanskrit radical *u*

PLURAL		
SANSKRIT	OLD SLAVONIC	LITHUANIAN
<i>rôd-ayâ-mas,</i>	<i>ryd-aye-m,</i>	<i>raud-oya-me</i>
<i>rôd-aya-tha,</i>	<i>ryd-aye-te,</i>	<i>raud-oya-te.</i>
<i>rôd-aya-nti,</i>	<i>ryd-ayûty,*</i>	<i>raud-oya.</i>

767 Both in Slavonic and in Lithuanian the *y* of this conjugational class is dropped before the formative elements which begin with a consonant, and then, in Lithuanian, only the *o* is left, and, in Slavonic, the more ancient *a*, which corresponds to it, hence, the infinitive in Lithuanian is *raud-o-ti*, in Slavonic *ryd-a-ti*, and the future in Lithuanian *raud-o-su*. The Sanskrit, on the contrary, preserves its *y* [G Ed p 1055] before formations beginning with a consonant, by the insertion of a vowel of conjunction, viz. *i*, hence, *rôd-ay-i-shyâmi* corresponding to the *raud-o-su* just mentioned, and in the infinitive *rôd-ay-i-tum* answering to *raud-o-ti*, *ryd-a-ti* †, sup. *ръидаѣтъ ryd-a-t*. The verbs under Paradigm B. in Dobrowsky and Kopitar have lost, in the present and the forms connected therewith, the *a* of the class character, and retain only the *y* (*glagol-yû*, "I speak," for *glagol-ayû*), but exhibit the *a* before formations beginning with a consonant, in accordance with the verbs which have *ayû* in the present, thus, e.g., *ръиголаѣхъ glagol-a-ch*, "I spoke," *glagol-a-ti*, "to speak," like *ръидаѣхъ ryd-a-ch*, *ръидаѣтъ ryd-a-ti*. The Lithuanian presents no forms analogous to verbs like *glagol-yû*, since forms like *myl-iu*, plural *myl-i-me*, correspond to Dobrowsky's third conjugation (e.g., *vol-yû*, plural *vol-i-m*, see §. 506. p 730. G ed.), while forms like *penu*, *laukau*, plural *pen-a-me*, *lauk-o-me* (see § 506 p. 731 G ed.), exhibit the Sanskrit *aya* in the abbreviated form,

* From *rydayo-nty*, see § 255 g

† I do not mean by this comparison to assert that the Lithuanian and Slavonic infinitive suffix is connected with that of the Sanskrit language

which in *raud oyu* *ryd ayû* enters save in the present indicative and its derivatives only before suffixes beginning with a consonant

768 The Lithuanian and Slavonic nominal bases like those of the kindred languages already mentioned when they terminate with a vowel which is generally the case reject this before the verbal derivative hence *e g* in Lithuanian *balt-oyu* 'I appear white' *balt inu* 'I make white' * from *balta* nom *ta s* white *duvan oyu* 'I bestow' from *duvana* fem *gift e-yst inu* 'I purify' from *e-ysta* nom *ta s* pure, † *gatau-ayu* [G Edp 1056] and *gatau yu* 'I make ready' from *gatau s* ready *daliyu* 'I divide' from *dali s* portion *apyok inu* 'I deride' from *apyoka s* jest *didd inu* 'I enlarge' from *diddi s* *brang inu* 'I render dear' from *brangu s* The following are examples of denominatives in Old Slavonic *дѣлѣ-ayû* 'I make' *дѣлѣ-а-чѣ* 'I made' from *дѣло* *dyelo* work *подобѣтъ* *podob-ye ty* 'it is fitting' infin *подобѣти* *podob a ti* from *podob a* use *зnamenaiy* *znamena yû* 'I denote' from *знамен* *znamen* nom *znamya* (see § 261) mark (Kopitar Glagol p 73) *глаголю* *glagol-yû* 'I speak' infin *глагол а ти* from *глаголо* nom *glagol* word In forms in *stî dyu* infin *ot a ti* the *st u* appears to me in departure from what has been remarked at § 255 h as a contraction of *au* or *ou* (§ 255 f) and the *v* of *ot-a ti* as the euphonic alteration of the final element of the diphthong *st ū=ov* The corresponding form in Lithuanian is *ayu* the first *u* of which before vowels likewise changes into its equivalent semi vowel hence *e g nas l' ayu* 'I live in widowhood' from *nas lē*

* Denominatives in *inu* have all a causal signification compare § 744

† With the formations in *ayu* compare the Greek in *ζω=yu* see § 762 *ayu* and *oyu* have the same mutual relation that *ζω* and *αζω* have to one another in Greek

"widow," pret. *naszl'-au-au*, fut. *naszl'-au-u*. So in Old Slavonic, *вдовѣи̑ vдов'-ŭ-yŭ*, pret. *вдововахъ vдов'-ov-ach*, infin. *вдововати vдов'-ov-a-ti*, from *вдова vdo-a*, "widow" = Sanskrit *vidhavā*, *именѣи̑ imen'-ŭ-yŭ*, "I name," infin. *именовати imen'-ov-a-ti*, from the base *имен imen*. Other examples of this kind occur in Dobrowsky, p 372. We may regard the *ŭ*, *ov*, of these forms as a prolongation of the theme of the base-noun, and divide, therefore, as follows *vдовŭ-yŭ*, *vдовov-a-ti*, *imenŭ-yŭ*, *imenov-a-ti*, where we must recall what has been observed at § 263 pp. 319, 350 G ed, regarding the inorganic introduction of Slavonic bases into the declension in *ти y*. In denominatives in *ѣи̑ ye-yŭ*, as, e. g., *богатыи̑ bogat'-ye-yŭ*, "I am or become rich," infin. *богатѣти bogat'-ye-ti*, from the base *богато*, nom. *bogat*,

[G Ed p 1057] *ye* corresponds to the Sanskrit *a* of *ayāmi*, which will not appear surprising when we consider the peculiarity of the Slavonic in constantly prefixing to vowels a *y*. The following are examples of denominatives from Dobrowsky's third conjugation (see § 505, p 729 G. ed). *женѣи̑ schen'-yŭ-sya*, "I marry," infin. *женити schen'-i-ti-sya*, from *жена schena*, "woman," *готовѣи̑ gotov'-lyŭ* (euphonic for *vyŭ*), "I prepare," infin. *готовити gotov'-i-ti*, from *готово gotovo*, nom. m *готовъ gotov*, "ready," *цѣлѣи̑ zyel'-yŭ*, "I heal," infin. *цѣлѣти zyel'-i-ti*, from *цѣло zielo*, nom *цѣлъ zyel*, "healthy"

769. I have already, in § 502., compared the Greek denominatives in *σσω*, as *αἵμας-σω* from *αἷματ-γω* (see § 501), with those in Sanskrit formed with *या*. While, however, in Sanskrit, the final vowel of the base-noun, if short, is lengthened, the same in Greek, according to the analogy of §. 762, is dropped, hence, e. g., *ἀγγέλλω* from *ἀγγελ(ο)-γω*, *ποικίλλω* from *ποικιλ(ο)-γω*, *αἰκάλλω* from *αἰκαλ(ο)-γω*, *μαλάσσω* from *μαλακ(ο)-γω*, *μειλίσσω* from *μειλιχ(ο)-γω*. Bases in *ρ*, *ρο*, and *ν*, transfer the *y*, vocalized to *i*, to the preceding syllable, instead of assimilating it to

the preceding consonant, hence τεκμαι ρ ο μαι from τεκμαρ-
 γο μαι from τεκμαρ καθαιρ ω from καθαρ(ο) γω from κα-
 θαρo μεγαρ ω from μεγαρ γω not from μεγα ς but from the
 base of the oblique cases μεγαλο the λ being exchanged for ρ
 (see § 20) μελαινω from μελαι γω from the base μελαι, ποι-
 μαιω πεπαινω τεκταινω αφραινω ευφραινω from ποιμαι γω
 &c from the bases ποιμει πειπον τεκτον αφροι ευφρον with
 the retention however of the original α instead of the mor-
 gamic vowels ε ο (see § 3) In denominatives from substan-
 tive bases in ματ as οιομαιω κυμαιω σπερμαιω σημαίνω
 χειμαιω the ν probably springs from the original form of the
 suffix ματ as this is a corruption of μαν and answers to the
 Sanskrit *man* and Latin *men min** It appears however to
 me impossible to determine with certainty [G Ed p 1058]
 as to the case of the preponderating number of denominatives
 in αινω, whose base nouns terminate neither in ν nor in ι
 letter which can have proceeded from ι I cannot however
 believe that the Greek language has produced such formations
 independently and that therefore they are entirely uncon-
 nected with the kind of forms handed down from the period
 of the unity of language Perhaps the bases in ν and those
 which terminate in ι consonant which is a corruption of ι have
 only supplied the type for the formations in αινω and verbs
 like αλεινω ακταινω γλυκαινω θερμαινω επιδαινω κηραινω
 have followed the beaten path in the same way as in Ger-
 man many bases have pressed into the so called weak de-
 clension in that they have extended the original limits of
 the base by the affix η or the syllable αν Perhaps too
 αινω in ι portion of that class of verbs which have this
 termination viz those which have sprung from other
 verbs is some way connected with the Sanskrit formation
 aya with which we have before compared Lithuanian

* See § 43, and compare G Curtius *De nominum Græcorum forma-
 tione* p 40

causals and denominatives in *anu* (see §. 745.). If the *v* in those denominatives which have not proceeded from bases in *v*, or *ματ* for *μαν*, is a corruption of the *y* (compare §. 715. p. 1027 G. ed), then the *αι* preceding might be regarded as representing the *ā* (compare § 753.), which, in most Sanskrit denominative bases in *या*, precedes the semi-vowel, for though this *ā* belongs to the nominal base, and is in general a lengthened form of short *a* (*chirā-yati*, "he delays," from *chira*, "long"), still the same, in course of time, might come to be regarded as a portion of the derivative, and the final vowel of the base-noun might be suppressed before its Greek representative *αι*, as in the formations in *αω*, *αζω*, &c. Those

[G Ed p 1059] verbs in *αινω* which appear to spring from more simple verbs, might, in their principle of formation, be contrasted in a different manner with the Sanskrit, as, *ε γ*, *αυαίνω* (*άύω*), *δραίνω* (*δράω*), *κραδαίνω* (*κραδάω*), *χαλαίνω* (*χαλάω*), stand in the same relation to the corresponding short forms, as, in the Vêda-dialect, *charanyāmi*, "I go,"* does to *charāmi*. The broader form comes from the noun of action *चरन् charana*, "the going" (euphonic for *-च -na*, on account of the *r* preceding). Some Sanskrit verbs, however, of this kind do not exactly correspond to the noun of action, from which they spring, but exhibit a weakening or contraction of the vowel, or the pure radical vowel instead of the gunised one of the base word, seemingly on account of the incumbrance caused by the verbal derivative, thus, *bhuranyāmi*, "I sustain" (Rig V 50. 6 *bhuranyantam anu*), from *bharana*, "the bearing," "sustaining" (R *bhar*, *bhri*); *turanyāmi*, "I hasten" (Rig. V. 121. 1 *turanyan*), from *twarana*, "the hastening" (R. *twar*), *churanyāmi*, "I steal" (see Westerg. Radices, p 337.), from *chōrana*, "the stealing" (R *chur*). As, according to rule, a noun of action in *ana*

* It occurs in combination with the preposition *ut*, "out," in the Yajur-Vêda, see Westergaard Rad p 337

may be formed from every root and on this too are based all the German and Ossetian infinitives * it could not surprise us were in Greek a few denominatives of this kind remaining whose base nouns had been lost and thus *e g* *αἰαίνω* from *αἰαίνυς* would come from a lost nominal base *αἰαίνο* or *αἰαίνη* *Μαραίνω* which has no short verb corresponding to it reminds us of the Sanskrit noun of action *mara na m* the dying from *mar* [G Ed p 1060] *mrī* to die causal *marayamī* Let attention be given to the Greek feminine abstracts in *ωνη* which correspond to the Sanskrit in *ana*, or *and* † Verbs in *αίω* may in part owe their origin to obsolete nominal bases in *αίο*

770 How necessary it is in the explanation of denominatives to look back to an earlier state of language and at the same time to examine the kindred dialects is shewn by an interesting class of Gothic denominatives in which the *n* likewise plays a part though it is no way connected with that of Greek verbs in *αίω* in whatever way these latter may be explained I rather recognise as already stated in my Conjugational System (pp 125 126) a connection in Gothic verbs like *ga fullna impleor* *us gutna effundor* *distaurna dirumpor* and *bundna solvor* *ga haulna sanor* *fra qvistna perdor* *ga vakna excitor* *us lukna aperior* *dauthna, morior* with the Sanskrit passive participles in *na* as *bhug na* bent to which the Greek verbals in *vo s* correspond (*στύγ vos σέμ ιος &c*) and from which the Gothic passive participles have somewhat diverged in that they do not append the suffix *na* direct to the root but retain the class syllable ‡ thus *biug a n(a)s* bent answering to भुङ्क्त् *bhug na s* while the verbs just mentioned point to a period of the language

* *E g* Gothic *bindan* O set *bathin*, to bind = Sanskrit *band* *ana* the binding

† Examples are *yachana* *pratio*, *arkana*, *honoris te tyficatio*

‡ But see p 119 G ed Note

when the suffix was still, as in Sanskrit and Greek, added direct to the root, so that, *e.g.*, *ga-skaidua*, "I separate myself" (1 Cor vii 11. *yaba gaskaidnai*, *ἐὰν χωρισθῇ*), answers better than *skaid-a-n-s*, "separated," to the Sanskrit *śākhin-nas* (euphonic for *chhid-nas*), "cleft" Compare, also, *and-bund-na*, "I am loosed (set free)," with *bund-a-n(a)-s*, [G Ed p 1061] "bound," *bi-auk-na*, "I am enlarged," with *bi-auk-a-n(a)-s*, "enlarged," *fialus-na*, "I am dissolved, destroyed, lost," with *lusa-n(a)-s*, "loosened" (Sanskrit *lū-na-s*, "cut off," "torn off"), *galuk-na*, "I am closed," with *ga-luk-a-n(a)-s*, "closed," *and-lét-na*, "I am unloosed," with *lét-a-n(a)-s*, "tranquil," *af-hyf-na*, "I am left remaining," "I remain over" (*περιλείπομαι*), with the to-be-presupposed *lib-a-n(a)s*, "left remaining" (*laibós*, "remnant"), for *lyf-a-n(a)-s*, as the law for the transposition of sounds (§. 87.) would lead us to expect, in answer to the Greek *λείπω*,* from the lost verb *leiba*, *laif*, *libum* (Old High German, *bi-libu*, "I remain," *bileib*, "I remained," *bi-libumés*, "we remained"), *ufar-haf-na*, "I raise myself above" (*ὑπερ-αίρομαι*), with *ufar-haf-a-n(a)-s*, "raised over," "elevated," *dis-taur-na*, "dis-rumpor," with *dis-taur-a-n(a)-s*, "disruptus," *ga-thaurs-na*, "I dry up" (*ξηραίνομαι*), with *ga-thaurs-a-n(a)-s*, "ἐξηραμμένος," from the un-citeable verb *ga-thaursa*, *ga-thaurs*, *gathaursum* *Dis-hnaup-na*, "disrumpor," from the root *hnup* (*hnnupa*, *hnaup*, *hnupum*, *hnupans*), is so far irregular as it has the radical vowel Gunised, whilst otherwise denominatives in *na*, like the passive participle with the same termination, attach themselves to one of the lighter forms of the verbal theme. *Us-geis-na*, also, "percellor," "stupeo," from the to-be-presupposed *geisa*, *gaiss*, *gisum* (Grimm II. p.46), is con-

* In departure from what has been remarked at p 452 G ed, I now agree with Benfey (Lexicon of Greek Roots, II p 11) in taking the Sanskrit root *rich* (from *rik*), "to separate," "to leave," as the root akin to the Latin *lic* (*linguo*), Greek *λιν*, and Gothic *lyf*, *lib*

trary to the common analogy and should be *us gisna*
But *dis skrit na findor* and *tundna* [G Ed p 1062]

uror the base verbs of which are likewise lost (*skreitā skrait skritum tinla tand tundum*) exhibit the regular vowel

771 After that *na* in Gothic *ns* in the above mentioned instances had once rised itself to be the exponent of the passive relation it might also extend itself to the adjective bases and thus denominatives in *na* and *ya* (for *ya* also *ai* see § 109 6) like passives (or neuter verbs) and transitive active verbs stand mutually answering to each other The final vowels of nominal bases are dropped as well before *na* as before *ya* (=Sanskrit *aya* see § 674) hence *e g* from the base *fulla* (nom masc *full s*) *full full na imphor full ya impleo* from *mikila* great (nom *mikil s*) *mikil na magnificor mikil ya magnifico* (compare μεγαλιζω) from *ieiha* (*ieih i*) holy *ieih na sanctificor ieih a* (*ieih ais*) *sanctifico*, from *ga noha* (*ganoh s*) enough *ga nōh na expleor ganōh ya expleo*, from *managa* (*manag s*) much *manag na abundo* (I nm made much) *manag ya augeo* from *gabiga* (*gabig s*) rich *gabig na locupletatus sum gabig ya locupleto*

It cannot surprise us that the base words of denominatives in *na* cannot be all cited from the lingual sources which have been preserved to our time nor that some were already obsolete in the time of Ulfila, but survive only in the denominatives of which they were the parents Thus *e g* nn adjective base *drōba* (*drobs*)

troubled (Anglos *drōf*) whence comes *drōb ya* I trouble excite shrink and *drōb na* I nm troubled is wanting Inseparable prepositions precede the denomina-

tives as they do the primitive verbal themes though the base word be simple as *e g* from *blindā* (*blind s*)

blind comes *ga blind na* I nm blinded and *ga blind -ya* I blind dazzle from *dumba* (*dumb s*) dumb *af dumb na* I become dumb grow speechless (Mark

[G Ed p 1063] IV. 39, *afdumbn*, *πεφίμωσο*). It is possible, that from the simple adjective bases at first simple denominatives proceeded, and from these, which no longer exist, or cannot be cited, compound denominatives, thus, from *dumba* came, at first, *dumbna*, and thence *afdumbna*, as, in Latin, from *mutu-s*, *mutesco*, and thence *obmutesco*.

772. To return to the Sanskrit, we must remark that denominatives formed with *ya* partly express a wish, as, e. g., *palî-yâmi*, "I wish for a spouse," from *palî*, *putrî-yâmi*, "I wish a son, or sons, or children," from *putra*. These forms lead us to the Greek desiderative denominatives in *ιαω*, which, however, in departure from the Sanskrit, reject the final vowel of the base-noun, while the latter lengthen it, but in doing so weaken *â* to *î*, thus, *putrî-yâmi* for *putrâ-yâmi** And Greek forms like *θανατ'-ιάω*, *στρατηγ'-ιάω*, *κλαυσ'-ιάω*, are properly based on the causal form of the just-mentioned Sanskrit denominatives in *ya*, thus, *θανατ'-ιάω*, *θανατ'-ιάο-μεν* = Sanskrit forms like *putrî-yayâ-mi*, *putrî-yayâ-mas*, while *putrî-yâ-mi*, *putrî-yâ-mas*, would lead us to expect Greek forms like *θανατ'-ιω*, *θανατ'-ιο-μεν*, or, according to § 502, *θανασσω*, *θανασσομεν*. It deserves, however, notice, that, in Sanskrit, denominatives in *ya* occasionally adopt the causal form without a causal signification; thus we find the gerund *asûyayitwâ*, which belongs to the causal form, without a causal meaning,† from the denominative *asû-yâmi*, "I curse, execrate" (intians. "I am wrath," from *asu*, "life").

* But we find in the Vêda-dialect *asûâ yâmi*, "*equos cupio*," from *asûwa*, "a horse" (S V II 1 1 1 2)

† Nal 14 17 *ki ôdhâd asûyayitwâ tam*, "*nâ exsecrando cum*" On the other hand, *dhûmâyayâmi*, the causal of *dhûmâ-yâmi*, "*fumo*," (Nah 3 1545) has also a causal meaning *dhûmâyayan dîśah*, "causing the regions of the world to smoke"

773 With the causal form of denominatives [G Ed p 1064] in *ya* may be compared also the Latin in *igā*. The *i* would then be the final vowel of the base noun either in an unaltered form as in *miti gā s* *levi gā s* *navi gā s* * or the weakening of a heavier vowel (see § 6) as in *fumi gā s* (for *fumu gā s* or *fumo gā s*) *remi gā s* *clari gā s* *casti gā s* (but *pur gā s* with *i* suppressed) or the morgraphic extension of a base ending in a consonant as in *liti gā s* opposed to *jur gā s*. The *g* must be taken as the hardening of *j* which indeed occurs perhaps nowhere else in Latin but is not uncommon in the kindred languages (see pp 121 and 1022 G ed) and with which is connected the fact that in Greek ζ often stands as the hardened form of an original *j* (see § 19). The *ā* of the forms in question as generally of those in the first conjugation (except where it is radical) must be the contraction of the Sanskrit *a(y)a* and thus *fumi gā s* would be as it were the Latinization of the Sanskrit *dhūmā ya(y)a si* thou makest to smoke †. If however we agree with the common opinion which however is opposed by Duntzer (Doctrine of the Latin Formation of Words p 140) in recognising in the verbs in *igo* compounds with *ago* we must then divide thus *mit igo fum igo* &c and assume a weakening of the radical *a* of *ago* to *i* and a transfer of *igo* from the third conjugation to the first both of which things occur in *facere* which at the end of compounds becomes *ficare*.

774 Bases which in Sanskrit end in *n* [G Ed p 1065] reject that letter as well in desideratives as also in other denominatives in *ya*. Other consonants also are occasionally dropped before the denominative suffix *ya* hence *vrihu yē* I become great (Mid) from *vrihat* in the strong

* I retract the conjecture expressed at § 109 i p 122 G ed

† See p 393 G ed, and § 772 Note †



cases *viñant*, properly a participle present from *vañh*, *viñh*, "to grow." Thus *tripát-yé*, *róhát-yé*, from the participles *tripant*, *tripat*, *róhant*, *róhat* (see Westergaard Rad pp. 337, 339) We might consequently expect, from the participle of the auxiliary future, forms like *dá-syát-yé* for *dás-yat-yé*, or *dásyant-yé*, and it follows that we may regard the Greek desideratives in *σείω* as denominatives, i. e. derive them from the participle, and not from the indicative future. The *c*, for instance, of *παρά-δω-σείω* must then be looked upon as the thinning of the *o* of the suffix *οντ*, and *παρά-δωσc'-ίω* must therefore be derived from *παράδωσο(ντ)-ιω*, just as above, § 503, *ἀεκ'-αζόμενος* from *ἀεκοντ*. But if Greek desideratives in *σείω* spring from a future participle, then Latin desideratives in *turio*, as *cœnatorio*, *nupturio*, *parturio*, *esurio* (from *es-turio*, see §. 101.), may be placed by their side as analogous forms* in which the *i* appears to correspond to the Sanskrit suffix *ya*, though usually the *i* of the Latin fourth conjugation corresponds to the Sanskrit *aya*, while the simple *ya* is represented by the *i* of the third conjugation. As, however, the *i* of the third conjugation is occasionally altered to

[G Ed p 1066] the *i* of the fourth,† it cannot surprise us that some denominatives of the Latin fourth conjugation should, in their origin, belong, not to the Sanskrit formation *aya*, but to *ya*, and so *equi'-io*, *equi'-i's*, both as regards its base word and its derivative, might be compared with the Vêdic *aśwâyâmi*, "equos cupio," mentioned above (§. 772. Note)

775 Denominatives with a desiderative meaning are

* The short *u* of verbs in *turio* occasions me no difficulty in deducing them from the participle in *tûu-s*. The incumbrance of the verbal derivation appears to have occasioned the shortening of the vowel, as in denominatives like *colôro*, *honôro*, compared with *color*, *colô-ris*, *honor*, *honôr-ris*.

† See § 500, and Struve "On the Latin Declension and Conjugation," p 200 (from *fodio*, in Plaut, *fodiri*, from *gradior* *aggrediri*, from *pario*, in Enn, *parire*, from *morior*, *morimur*)

also formed in Sanskrit by the suffixes *syā* and *asyā* e g *trishasyāmi* to long for the bull *aurā syāmi* to long for the stallion (*equus*) *madhū asyāmi* to wish for honey We have already noticed the agreement of these forms with that of the auxiliary future as also as respects the sibilant with the desideratives which spring from verbal roots From Latin may be adduced imitatives in *ssō* as has already been done by Duntzer (Doctrine of the Latin Formation of Words p 135) Whence e g *patris* *ssō* would stand by assimilation for *patris* *ssō* (compare the Prakrit futures § 625) with *ssō* the extension of the base noun as in *patris*-*ssō* The *ssō* of *atque* *ssō* *gracis* *ssō* is the weakening of the final vowel of the base noun The first conjugation however does not admit of comparison with Sanskrit desideratives like *aurā syāti* which leads us to expect the Latin third conjugation as in derivatives from verbs like *cape*-*ssō* *incipi*-*ssō* *lucē*-*ssō* *peti*-*ssō* which admit of comparison with Sanskrit verbal desideratives in *ssā*—in so far as their *ss* really stands for *sy*—or also with the auxiliary future The *e* or *i* of Latin forms is however most probably the class vowel of the third conjugation though usually this does not extend beyond the special tenses *Incessō* from *cedo* is probably an abbreviation of *incedesso* and *arcesso* if it comes from *cedo* of *arcedesso*

776 Outwardly a similarity presents it [G Ed p 1007] self between the Sanskrit nominal desideratives in *syā* or *asyā* and the Latin inchoatives in *asco* and *esco* these however as respects their principle of formation are scarcely transmitted from the time of the unity of language but most probably first originated on Roman ground by the annexation as it appears to me of the verb substantive with the meaning to become to nominal bases, which when they terminate in a vowel drop this before the vowel of the auxiliary verb (compare (§ 761 p 1017 G ed) Thus *aspos sum* from *pot sum* for *poti sum* *pot eram* for *poti eram* so e g *puell-asco*

vi'-ascor, *puer'-asco* (from the base *pueru,-rō*), *tener'-asco*, and *tener'-esco*, *acel'-asco*, *gel'-asco* (from *gelu*), *heib'-esco*, *exagv'-esco*, *plum'-esco*, *flamm'-esco*, *amar'-esco*, *aur'-esco*, *clar'-esco*, *vetust'-esco*, *dulc'-esco*, *juven'-esco*, *celebr'-esco*, *corn'-esco*. Whether we ought to divide *long'-isco*, *vetust'-isco*, or *longi-sco*, *vetusti-sco*, may remain undecided. In the former case the *i* of the auxiliary verb might be compared with that of the Greek imperative ἴσθι in the latter, *i* is the weakening of the final vowel of the adjective base, as in compounds like *longi-pes* and derivatives like *longi-tudo*. Bases ending in a consonant experience no abbreviation, thus, *ai-boi-esco*, *carbon-esco*, *lapid-esco*, *matr-esco*, *noct-esco*, *dil-esco*, but *opul-esco* for *opulent-esco*, which reminds us of the Sanskrit denominatives from abbreviated participial bases in *nt* mentioned above (§. 774.) The verb substantive, which I think I recognise in these formations, answers to the obsolete future *esco* (*escit*, *superescit*, *obescit*), which, however, in composition, has occasionally retained the original *a*; as in Old Prussian, also, in the simple state, *as-mai*, *as-sai*, *as-t*, correspond to the Lithuanian *es-mi*, *es-si*, *es-ti*. How close the notions of futurity and of becoming, as of future existence, approach one another needs no mention. With respect to

[G Ed p 1068] the guttural which has attached itself to the root of the verb substantive, *asco*, *esco*, and the isolated future *escit*, resemble the Greek imperfect ἔσκειν, which, with the rejection of the radical vowel, enters also into combinations with attributive verbs (δινύει-σκε, καλέει-σκε, ἐλάσει-σκε)* The Latin *esco*, also, when added to

* I have no hesitation in ascribing the vowel which precedes the *σ* to the temporal base of the simple verb, for the *ο* of ἐκάλεον is, in its origin, identical with *ε*, and stands in place of the *ε* of ἐκάλεες, ἐκάλεε, only on account of the nasal which follows the *ε* of the 3d person of the 1st aorist is identical with the *α* of the other persons, which is everywhere retained where a termination follows

verbal bases relinquishes its initial vowel for the *a* (*u*) *e* (*e*) and *i* (*i*) of forms like *laba sco ama sco consuda sco genera sco palle sco ure-sco rube sco senti sco obdormi sco* are clearly the characters of the first second and fourth conjugations, on which account we here divide differently than above in *puer asco clar esco dulc esco* &c In compounds with bases of the third conjugation the *i* of *e g gemi-sco tremi sco* must be regarded as by nature short as it is identical with the *i* of *gem i s, trem i s* (see § 109 1 p 114 G ed) which leads us back to the Sanskrit *a* The *i* of *profici-scor concupi scor* is identical with that of *faci s profici s cupi s nanci scor* presupposes a simple *nanco nanci s frage sco* exhibits *e* for the *i* of *frangi s* (compare § 6), and has lightened itself by the rejection of the nasal of the root To Latin forms like *laba sco ama sco, palle sco* Greek forms like *γηρα σκω ηβασκω ιλα σκομαι αλθη σκω*, correspond in their principle of formation where however it is not asserted that the Latin *e* of the second conjugation is connected with the Greek *η* of forms like *πεφιλη κα φιλησω* though both lead us back to the Sanskrit *aya* but of this the Latin contains the two first letters in the contraction of *ai* to *e* (see § 109 6 p 120 G ed) while the Greek [C Ed p 1069] *η* of *φιλησω* and *εε εο* of *φιλεετε φιλεομαι* contain the first and third letter of the Sanskrit *aya* either separate (in *εε εο*) or united in *η* The *i* of forms like *ευρι σκω στερι σκω αλι σκομαι αμβλι σκω* is scarcely a vowel of conjunction but in my opinion only a weakening of a heavier vowel thus *ευρισκω στερι σκω* for *ευρησκω στερη σκω αμβλι σκω αλι σκομαι* for *αμβλω σκω αλω σκομαι* to which among other things the futures *ευρη σω αλω σομαι* &c point We must remark the weakening of *o* to *i* in *οι ιημι* for *ονοιημι οπιπτειω* for *οποπτειω* * and moreover the forms *αλθη σκω*

See § 754 and compare *οπωπη* and *οπωπ ω* which forms by the lengthening of the radical vowel in the second syllable of the root which

and ἀλθί-σκω, which exist together. I am now inclined, in departure from what was remarked at §. 751. p. 1037 G ed., to assume that the Greek reduplicated forms in σκω, in spite of their striking resemblance to Sanskrit verbal desideratives like *gṛhāsāmi* (compare γιγνώσκω), are nevertheless not historically connected with them, but, as comparatively younger formations, have arisen from the junction of the verb substantive in a form analogous to the imperfect ἔσκειν and Latin future *escit*, but deprived of the radical vowel, to roots repeated according to the principle of the Sanskrit third class (see §. 109³ p. 118 G ed.) Thus, γιγνώσκω, μιμνήσκω, pre-suppose simple verbs like γίγνομαι, μίμνημι, according to the analogy of δίδωμι, τίθημι, βίβημι, or such as γιγνώω, μιμνέω. And ἔγνω and γνώσω bear the same relation to the probably existent γίγνομαι that ἔδω and δώσω do to δίδωμι. If, however, the Greek reduplicated forms in σκω must, with regard to their principle of formation, be looked on as distinct from Sanskrit verbs like *gṛhāsāmi*, the same must hold as regards

[G Ed p 1070] Latin forms like *no-sco*, *di-sco* (perhaps from *didā-sco*), *pa-scor*, *na-scor* (*gna-scor* by transposition from *gan-scor*), which correspond to Greek unreduplicated forms like βά-σκω, θνή-σκω

777 In Sanskrit, denominatives may also be formed by annexing simply an *a* to the theme of nominal bases in the special tenses, which *a*, like that of the first and sixth classes of primitive verbs (§ 109¹), is suppressed in the general tenses. A final *a* of nominal bases is dropped, hence, *e g*, *lōhāt-a-ti*, "he is red," from *lōhata*. I am unable to quote from authors instances of such denominatives there occur, however, among the roots exhibited by Indian Grammarians of the first or sixth class, several in which I think I recognise denominatives from bases in

is twice repeated in its full form, correspond admirably to the Sanskrit intensives there mentioned

a thus among others *bhām* to be angry *bhām-a tē* he is angry which I derive from *bhām a* anger this latter however, which also signifies light, splendor clearly comes from the root *bhā* to shine As the Latin *i* of the third conjugation corresponds to the Sanskrit *a* of the first and sixth class so *metu i t tribu i t statu i t minu i t* correspond to the Sanskrit denominatives here mentioned In Greek denominatives correspond which in the special tenses add *o* and *e* to the nominal base thus *e g* *μητι ο μει μητι e τε δηρι ο μαι μητι ο μαι δακρυ ο μεν, μεθυ-ο μεν ιθυ ο μει αχλυ ο-μει βασιλευ ο μει βρα βευ ο-μει* What however are we to say of that rather numerous class of denominatives in *ευ* which are not founded on any nominal base in *ευ e g* *κορ ευο μαι* I am a maiden *πολιτ ευ ω* I am a citizen *αθλ ευ-ω* I contend properly am in strife *ιατρ ευ-ω* I am a physician *κρατιστ ευ ω* I am the best *κολακ ευ ω* I am a flatterer flatter ing *δουλ ευ ω* I am a servant *αληθ [G Ed p 1071]* *ευ ω* I am true ? If the verb substantive which in most of these formations is more or less evidently present in spirit be also contained therein bodily we must then have recourse to the root *φν* (see p 195 G ed) which therefore in these compounds has preserved the original notion of being while in its simple state the causal meaning of bringing into existence making to be prevails The *e* of *ευω* would therefore be the Guna vowel corresponding to the *a* of the Sanskrit *bhāi ā mi* I am' I become and with respect to the dropping of the radical labial *ευω* would stand on the same footing with *ui ui* of Latin forms like *pot ui mon ui ama ui audi ui* (see § 556) * In Gothic the verbs

* The Os etian also has in its simple state lost the labial of the auxiliary verb under discussion and gives *e g* *ua d* let him be *wonh* let them be corresponding to the Sanskrit *bhāiātu bhāiantu* see *The Caucasian Members of the Indo European Family of Languages*

in *na* (as *fullna*, "*impleor*"), mentioned above (§. 770), belong to the class of denominatives here mentioned. These verbs in *na* come from passive participial bases with the same termination, which, like the Sanskrit bases in *a* (*rôhit'-a-ti*), reject their final vowel before that of the class, thus, *fulln'-i-th*, "*impletur*," from *fullna-i-th*, for *fulln-a-ath* (see § 67.), plural *fulln'-a-nd*, as in Sanskrit *rôhit'-a-ti*, *rôhit'-a-nti*. But this kind of formation holds, in Gothic, only for the present and its derivatives, while in the preterite an *ô* takes the place of *a* or *i*, so that, *e. g.*, *fulln'-ô-da*, "I was filled," in its principle of formation agrees with Latin forms like *regn'-ô-vi*, the base-noun also of which, *regnu* ("kingdom as ruled"), with respect to its derivative suffix, is connected with the to-be-presupposed Gothic base *fullna* (Sanskrit *pūrṇa*, "filled").

FORMATION OF WORDS

[G Ed p 1072] 778 With regard to the formation of verbs there remains nothing to be added to what has been already said regarding the structure of roots and the classes of verbal bases (§. 109'), which proceed thence, and subsequently respecting the formation of derivative verbs. The primitive pronouns, and the appellations of cardinal numbers, do not follow the ordinary rules for the formation of words (see § 105), and, with their derivatives, are discussed in the paragraphs allotted to them. We shall now simply treat of the formation of substantives and adjectives, and, first, of those which stand in close connection with the verb, and, both in the organization and in the application of language, play a very important part. We allude to the participles and the infinitive. It might be said that we ought to treat of

pp 43 and 82, Rem 48. In Persian the present of the verb substantive may be combined with any substantive or adjective, as well as with the personal pronoun, *e. g.* *pū am*, "*seneæ sum*," *manam*, "*ego sum*."

the formation of nouns before treating of their inflection because words must be formed before they can be inflected. But for practical considerations it appeared more useful at first only to lay down the principle of the formation of words generally as is done in §§ 110 111 and to defer the more full investigation of the subject to this place. At all events the theory of the formation of tenses must precede that of the participles as the latter for the most part irrespective of their nominal suffixes rest on a principle of formation similar to that of the corresponding tenses of the indicative and bear a sisterly if not a filial relation to them. It will however be clearly seen from the following paragraphs how requisite an acquaintance with the forms of cases and with the distinction of genders is to the understanding of the theory of the formation of words.

779 The active present participle forms [G Ed p 1073] a point of observation as regards the representation of the original unity of the Indo European languages and it is here worthy of notice that several of the still living tongues of our quarter of the world have in some cases preserved the original formative suffix in a more perfect form than the Sanskrit in its most ancient sources. The full form of the suffix is *nt* the Sanskrit however exhibits the *n* only in the few cases which in all places where a division of the theme into stronger and weaker forms occurs have preserved the original and full form of the base (see § 129) hence *e g* *bharan bharantam* = *φέρων φερόντα ferentem* dual *bharantāu* Vedic *bharantā* (nom acc voc) = *φεροντε* plural *bharantas* (nom voc) = *φεροντες ferentes* but in the accusative we find *bharatas* by the loss of the *n* in the latter part of the word disadvantageously contrasted with *φεροντ ας* and so in all the other cases of the three numbers the *n* is dropped in Sanskrit and in the genitive singular *bharatas* stands from this loss in an inferior position when compared with the Greek

φέρωντος, Latin *ferentis*, Gothic *bairandin-s* (see p. 138), and our German strong participial-genitives, as *stehendes*, *gehendes* ' The Lithuanian, also, has to this day retained the nasal of the participle present through all the cases of the three numbers in both genders. it extends the theme, however, in the oblique cases, by the addition of *ia*, and, according to a universal law of sound, changes the *t* before *i*, when this is followed by any vowel but *i*, into the sound *tsch*, which Ruhig writes *ch*, Mieleke *cz*, hence, e.g., *degans*,

[G Ed p 1074] "burning," m. (=Sanskrit *dahan*), according to the analogy of Zend forms like *barans*, Latin like *ferens*, Æolic as τιβένς, accusative *degantun* (for *degantien*, from *-ian*), genitive *deganchuo*

780. The Old Prussian, differing from the Lithuanian, extends the participial base in the oblique cases by the simple affix *i*, and so far agrees entirely with the Latin, which, e.g., forms simply *ferens* from the base *ferent*, which has not exceeded its original limits, but which, in all the other cases, follows the analogy of bases in *i* *Ferenti-a* and *ferenti-um* belong as decidedly to the *i* declension as *facili-a*, *facili-um*. We are therefore right in dividing *ferente-m* just as *facile-m* (from *facili-m*), though from a base *ferent* the accusative could be in no case other than *ferentem*=Zend *barēnt-ēm*. The present participles masculine which remain to us in Old Prussian are, *dilants*, "the worker," "working†," *sīdāns*, "*sedens*," *emprīki-sins*, "*præsens*," dative *emprīki-senti-smu*, according to the pro-

* Verbs of the third class, in Sanskrit, owing to the incumbrance of the syllable of reduplication, have lost the nasal in the strong cases also, hence, e.g., *dadatam* compared with *δίδοντα*, *dadatas* with *δίδοντες* (compare § 459)

† According to the mode in which the two following examples are written we should expect *dilāns*, but as respects the retention of the T-sound, *dilants* corresponds to Gothic forms like *bairands*

nominat declension (see § 170) *maubillinti s* of the under
 nge not speaking * (*infantis*) *ripinti n† sequentem*
empriki waitiaini ns (acc pl) *contradientes, uargu*
seggienti ns *maleficos* The following are [G Ed p 1075]
 adverbial datives *giuantei* living and *stanintei* (also *staninti*)
 standing from the bases *giuanti* (Sanskrit *giuant*) *staninti*
 (see Nesselmann pp 52 and 76)

781 Before the feminine character : the Sanskrit, ac-
 cording to the difference of conjugation of the respective
 verbs either retains the nasal of the participial suffix or
 rejects it, and in such a manner as that verbs of the first
 principal conjugation regularly retain it and but rarely
 reject it while conversely those of the second ordinarily
 reject it and only occasionally retain it and the Gothic
 and Lithuanian have constantly preserved it. Compare
e g with the Sanskrit *vasanti* inhabiting f (also *va*
sati Nal 13 66) from *vas* Class 1 the Gothic *visandei*
 (Them *visandein* see §§ 120 112) abiding or being f
 and with the Sanskrit *dahanti* burning f the Lithuanian
deganti (gen *deganchios* see p 171 Note *) In Greek
θεραπευτρίς is in form a solitary present participle feminine
 with *ιδ*=Sanskrit : according to the analogy of the femi-
 nine bases in *τριδ*=*tri* Latin *tri c* mentioned in § 119
 The root *सृ* as Class 2 of the verb substantive forms in
 Sanskrit *sati*, being f never *santi* the Lithuanian
esanti therefore surpasses the Sanskrit both in the reten-
 tion of the radical vowel and in that of the n of the suffix

* *Bili* I speak The inseparable preposition *au* combined with
 the negation *ni*, corresponds to the Sanskrit *ana*

† Also *ripintinton* in the last syllable of which I think I recognise an
 appended pronoun or article=Sanskrit *tam* Lithuanian *tan* Greek *τό*
 As regards the *o f r a* compare the accusative of the participle perfect
 passive *dato n datum* =Sanskrit *dattam* from *dadātam* irregularly
 for *dātam*

In the masculine nominative, also, the Lithuanian *esans* has two points of superiority to the Sanskrit *san*, the retention of the radical vowel, and of the nominative sign: the latter is shared also by the Latin *sens*, of *præ-sens*, *ab-sens*, to which the abovementioned (§ 780.) Old Prussian *sins*, of *emprîki-sins*, "present," admirably corresponds. The Greek, for the most part, with its *ῶν*, contrasts disadvantageously with the Lithuanian *esans*, for while the latter has, together with the case sign, preserved the complete root, we miss in *ῶν* both the entire root and the expression of the nominative relation. The epic and Ionic form *ῥών*, however, leads us [G Ed. p 1076] to conjecture a formerly existing *ῥῶν*, and the suppression of the *σ* in this position is, according to § 128, not surprising. It is, however, not less marvellous that a form which, in Greek, has been corrupted for thousands of years, quite up to remote antiquity, and which has been tolerably accurately retained by the Latin only under the protection of the prepositions *præ* and *ab*,* should have remained quite perfect in the Lithuanian up to the present day.

782. The Indian Grammarians assume *at*, in the strong cases *ant*, as the suffix of the participle present. I cannot, however, attribute to the suffix the *a* of forms like *bhūrant*, any more than the *o* of the Greek *φέρωντ* the vowel belongs in both languages to the class syllable, *i e* the *o* of *φέρ-ο-ντ* is identical with that of *φέρ-ο-μεν*, *φέρ-ο-ντι*, and with the *ε* of *φέρ-ε-τε*, *φέρ-ε-ς*, &c. That the Greek participial suffix is simply *ντ*, not *οντ*, is clear from the conjugation in *μι*, where *ντ* attaches to the final vowel of the root or of the verbal theme (*δίδο-ντ*, *τιθε-ντ*, *ἵστα-ντ*, *δαικ-νυ-ντ*) the Sanskrit, however, in accordance with a peculiarity, which, in my opinion, first arose after the separation of languages,

* On the other hand, in *potens*, just as in the simple *ens*, the sibilant is lost

in cases where the *nt* or *t* of the suffix would be added to a letter other than *a* or *a* prefixes to the suffix *an a* (compare § 437 Remark and § 458) or extends the verbal theme by the affix *a* hence, *e g strinuant* strewing (for *strinunt*) answers to the Greek base *στροπυνν* The *e* of Latin participles of the third conjugation *e g* of *veh e ns* *veh e ntem* (=Sanskrit *rah a n rah a ntam* Zend *raz a ns raz a ntem*) is in origin identical with the class vowel *i* (from *a* see § 109 1 p 114 G ed) of *veh i s* *veh i t* &c (see § 507 p 712) and is based on the circumstance [G Ed p 107] that before two consonants the Latin language prefers *e* to *i* (see § 6) In the fourth conjugation *ie e g* in *aud i ens* represents the Gothic *ya* and Sanskrit *aya* of forms like *sat ya nds* placing =Sanskrit *sad aya n* making to sit (compare § 505) It does not require mention that in verbs of the first and second conjugation the *a* and *e* as in *am a ns* *mon e ns* belong to the conjugational syllable, the *a* however of *da ns* *sta ns* *fa ns* and *fla ns* to the root and as little does it require notice that in German and Lithuanian the vowel which precedes the *n* of the present participle is identical with that of the class syllable Compare in Gothic *bair a nds* carrying in *vahs ya nds* (Zend *ucs ya ns*) growing in (see § 109 2) *sat ya nds* placing making to sit in *salb o nds* amounting in with *bair a m* (Sanskrit *bhar a mas*) we carry *vahs ya m*, we grow *sat ya m* we place (Sanskrit *sād aya mas*) *salb o m* we amount and in Lithuanian *ue a ns* riding in with *ue a me* we ride *myl i ns* loving in with *myl i me* we love With regard however to the non correspondence of the Lithuanian *es a ns* being to *es mi* I am *es me* we are we must observe that here an auxiliary vowel is necessary in the participle which in the Sanskrit *s a n* (accusative *s a ntam*) occurs in the same form while the Latin *sens* places in its stead an *e* and the Old Prussian *sins an i*

793 In Old Slavonic, the so-called gerundives correspond to the participles of the kindred languages, and that of the present to the active present participle here under discussion. In the nominative singular masculine, where, *e g*, БЕЗЪ *vežy*, "vehens," answers to the Sanskrit *rahan*, Zend *vazant*, Lithuanian *vežans*, and Gothic *vigands*, we should scarce observe the analogy of the Slavonic form to those of the kindred languages, as, according to a universal law of

[G Ed p 1078] sound, all final consonants in Slavonic are suppressed,² but in the dual, БЕЗѢЮЩА *vežunshcha*, corresponds to the Vêdic *rahantâ* and Zend *vazanta*, and in the plural, БЕЗѢЮЩЕ *(vežunshche)* answers to the Sanskrit *vahant-as*, and Greek *ἔχοντες* (see § 442 Note³), where it is to be observed, that *т* *shch* more frequently occurs as the euphonic alteration of *t* (Dobrowsky, p. 39, Kopitar, p. 53), just as *d*, under similar circumstances, becomes *д*, *schd* a sibilant, therefore, is prefixed to the *T*-sound, and, besides, the original *t* is changed into *ch*, as in Lithuanian likewise the latter is used before *i*, with a vowel following

* See § 255 l, page 339 G ed I now think that the monosyllabic words also must be subjected to the universal law, as I no longer recognise in the forms НАСЪ *nas* and ВАСЪ *vas* of the genitive and locative plural of the two first persons the Sanskrit secondary forms *nas* and *vas*, but refer the *с* of the genitive to the Sanskrit pronominal genitive termination *sâm*, and that of the locative to the Sanskrit locative termination *su* The fact that the *s* of these terminations is elsewhere changed into *х* *ch* (see §§ 255 m 279 and p 371, G ed Note⁶), and that in Sanskrit the genitive termination *sâm* occurs only in pronouns of the third person plural, conceals the casual nature of the ending of the forms НАСЪ *na-s*, ВАСЪ *va-s*, but in Old Prussian also the termination *самъ* *sâm*, in the form *son*, which approximates more closely to the Sanskrit, has made its way into the pronouns of the first and second person, hence here are found *nou-son*, *ημῶν*, *you-son*, *ὕμῶν*, after the analogy of *stei-son*, *των*=Sanskrit *te-shâm*, answering to the Slavonic НАСЪ *na-s* and ВАСЪ *va-s*.

† As to *ѣ* = *un*, see the Remark at the end of this paragraph

Compare therefore in this respect the dual незѣнѣ *režunshchu* with the Lithuanian *ue-anchiu*. It is probable that in Slavonic also as well as in Lithuanian ч *y* or the syllable *ya* has in the oblique cases mingled with the *t* of the participial suffix and under the influence of the *y* the preceding *t* has become ш *shch*. So in Dobrowsky's third conjugation in which in the first person present ч *y* is found before the termination *un* forms occur like [G Id p 1079] мѣнѣмъ *munshchun* *turbo* euphonic for *muntyun* infinitive *munti* *i ti* *. In the feminine singular the gerundive spoken of is незѣнѣнѣ *režunshchē* = Lithuanian *uezanti* riding *f* (genitive *ue-anchios*) Sanskrit *lahanti*.

Remark I Dobrowsky to whose grammar I was circumscribed in treating (§ 150) of the Old Slavonic alphabet makes neither an orthographical nor a phonetic distinction between ѣ and о or ѣ and ѣ and never uses the first mentioned letter as he everywhere writes *io* for *ī*. It is now however generally supposed and I think with good reason that the vowels ѣ (with *y* ī) and ѣ (with *y* ī) contain a nasal as was first discovered by Vostokov though Kopitar (Glagolita p 30) still thinks it doubtful. It is however certain that the vowels ѣ ѣ ѣ in the Old Slavonic Grammar as Kopitar has informed us occur scarce any where but where the Polish has vowels with a nasal and comparison with the ancient allied languages leads us to expect a nasal for which reason I have before assumed a corruption of *on* (from *an*) to *ū* (see § 100 *). On the other hand however о or ѣ and the *u* contained in *io* (*y*) wherever these letters occur in Old Slavonic in their proper place in forms which admit of comparison usually represent etymologically the Sanskrit अं *a* (for *a+u*) or its resolved form *ai* hence *e g* оуѣ *rusta* (nominative plural) 'mouth' = *os/tha* lip (Theme) троуѣнѣ *to hear* = *srotum* (irrespective of the infinitive suffix) роуѣнѣ *būd i ti* to write = *bodayitum* моуѣнѣ *left* = *sayya*. So in the termination of the genitive and locative dual here *e g* оуѣ *amborum in ambobus* answers to the Sanskrit *ulhayor* and Zend *uboyo* (see § 273). Now let us examine the cases in which nasalized vowels the nasal of which

* Miklosich aptly compares the Sanskrit root *ṛan̄th* to shake and ṛ *un* therefore stands for the Sanskrit *an*. See the Remark at the end of this paragraph.

I now express, as in Lithuanian, by *n* (see §. 10), in grammatical terminations or suffixes, correspond to a Sanskrit *n* or *m* with a preceding vowel (*a* or *á*) We have, therefore, if I have not overlooked any thing, the following —

- 1 Accusative singular of feminine bases in *a*, *e* *g*, БАОВѣ *vdovun*, “*viduam*” = *vidharám*
[G Ed p 1080]
- 2 Accusative singular of pronouns of the first and second person МА *man*, ТА *tañ* = Sanskrit *mám*, *tuám*, like the reflexive ТА *san*
- 3 Accusative plural of masculine pronominal bases of the third person in *ya*, and therefore also of definite adjectives compounded with the base *ya* Compare ТА *yan*, “*eos*,” with the corresponding Sanskrit *yán*, “*quos*,” and Old Prussian accusatives like *scha-ns*, *schu-ns*, “*hos*,” *win-a-ns*, “*uos*,” Gothic *vau-a-ns* (see § 236)
- 4 First person singular present, where А *un* = Sanskrit *ám*, *e* *g*, *vežun* = *vahám*, Аи *ayun* = *ayám*, *e* *g*, *rydayun* = *rôdayám* (see § 766 p 1054 G ed)
- 5 Third person plural of the present, where АНТ *unt* = Sanskrit *anti*, *e* *g*, БЕЖАНТ *vežunt* = *vahanti*, and in Dobrowsky's third conjugation (see Kopitar, p 61), АНТ *yant* = Sanskrit *ayanti*
- 6 The above-mentioned gerundive or participle present

The nasal vowel in the genitive singular and nominative and accusative plural of feminine bases in *ya*, *e* *g*, in БОАИ *volyan*, “*voluntatis*,” and “*voluntates* (nom acc),” appears surprising If we consider, however, that, in the three cases spoken of, the Sanskrit grammar exhibits a final *s*, which is also contained in those languages so closely akin to the Slavonic, the Lithuanian and Lettish, as also in Gothic in all the words which cor-

* Compare § 266 The Polish also, in the corresponding forms, has a written nasal vowel, though now, at the end of a word, the nasals, though written, are no longer pronounced, just so in the instrumental, where I regard the Slavonic *vdovoy-un* = Sanskrit *vidharay-á* as joining to the old instrumental termination the new also, with a corruption of the *my* (Dobr gives only *m*) to the probably only very weak nasal sound *n* Remark, that in the plural instrumental, the feminines especially, rather than the masculines and neuters, have the termination *mi* (see p 365 G ed), for which, in Lithuanian, both in the masculine and feminine, *mis* occurs, only that the masculines in *a* have contracted *a-mis* to *ais*

respond to the Sanskrit feminine bases in *ā**, we are led to infer the nasalization of a final *s* as *eg* in the I rīkrit instrumental termination *hin*=Sanskrit *bhis* (see § 220). The *y* especially appears [Gr Ed p 1081] to have protected the nasalized vowels which follow it as we may conclude from No 3 and the gerundives mentioned below (Remark 2). A place where the Old Slavonic has a nasal vowel at the end of a word, while the Sanskrit has a simple vowel occurs in the nominative and accusative singular of neuter bases in *n eg* in *ИМѦ imen nomen* (from the base *imen* from *iman*) answering to the Sanskrit *nāma* from *naman*. Here, however, the nasal of the Slavonic nominative and accusative can not surprise us as it belongs to the base word and the Latin also has firmly preserved the *n* of the base in the nominative and accusative singular neuter. Thus *nsim* Latin *nomen semen* are opposed to *homo sermo*. So *ИМѦ imen*, *СѦМѦ syeman* are opposed to *КАМѦ kamy* stone from *hamen*.

Remark 2 The verb substantive gives ṣṭi sy = Sanskrit *san* Lithuanian *sens* and in the feminine ṣṭi jhi = *santi* (for *santi*) *senti*. After the *y* in the nominative masculine the nasal *nd* and the old *a* remain hence ṣṭi jhi *byan* *cedens* feminine ṣṭi jhi *byanschi*. In Dobrowsky's third conjugation the *i* extends also to the other forms with *ji* hence ṣṭi jhi *tolyan* *tolens* " ṣṭi jhi *toljanschi* *tolentes* ṣṭi jhi *toljanschi* *tolensa*. As regards the use of the gerund it is limited to those constructions in which the participle present stands as predicate and in German the uninflected form of the participle is used hence (Luke $\text{xxiv } 13$) ṣṭi jhi *byesta idunshcha*,

they (two) were going is the translation of the Greek *ἦσαν πρὶν μεῖναι*, only with this point of difference, in which the Greek is inferior that the Slavonic has the dual of the verb as well as that of the participle. Where the participle stands as epithet or substantively the Slavonic uses the definite form of the participle (see § 984) and in this the participle is fully declined thus *Ἦσαν ἀπὸ κομῆς ἀπὸ τοῦ ποταμοῦ* is rendered *Вѣдѣ отъ ѿмѣи ѿ рѣки* *lysl otlo janshelchunyn*

784 The same suffix that forms the present participle

* So in Lettish *alka* s is both the genitive singular and the nominative and accusative plural of *akka* spring of water (compare Latin *aqua* Gothic *alra* stream genitive singular and nominative and accusative plural *alro* s Lithuanian *uppe* stream Sanskrit *ap* 'water')

is added in Sanskrit and Zend to the theme of the auxiliary future, just as in Greek and Lithuanian, where $\delta\acute{\omega}\text{-}\sigma\omega\text{-}\nu$, $\delta\acute{\omega}\text{-}\sigma\omicron\nu\text{-}\tau\alpha$, $d\tilde{u}\text{-}se\text{-}ns$, $d\tilde{u}\text{-}se\text{-}ntm$, correspond to the Sanskrit $d\tilde{a}\text{-}sya\text{-}n$, $d\tilde{a}\text{-}sya\text{-}ntam$. In the feminine the Lithuanian $d\tilde{u}\text{-}se\text{-}nti$, "the (woman) about to give," answers admirably to the Sanskrit $d\tilde{u}\text{-}sya\text{-}nti$, $deg\text{-}se\text{-}ns$, "the (man) about to burn," accusative $deg\text{-}se\text{-}ntm$, answers to the Sanskrit $dhak\text{-}\dot{s}hya\text{-}n$, $dhak\text{-}\dot{s}hya\text{-}ntam$,* and in the

[G Ed p 1082] feminine, $deg\text{-}se\text{-}nti$ to $dhak\text{-}\dot{s}hyu\text{-}nti$. The Lithuanian root *bu*, "to be," gives $bu\text{-}se\text{-}\acute{u}s$, "*futurus*," $bu\text{-}se\text{-}nti$, "*futura*," as analogous to the Zend $b\tilde{u}\text{-}sya\text{-}ns$, $b\tilde{u}\text{-}sya\text{-}nti$. The Sanskrit $bhav\text{-}i\text{-}shya\text{-}n$, $bhav\text{-}i\text{-}shya\text{-}nti$, is somewhat more remote, on account of the Guna of the radical vowel, the insertion of the vowel of conjunction, and the suppression of the nominative sign in the masculine. As regards the *e* of Lithuanian future participles like $d\tilde{u}\text{-}se\text{-}ns$, $bu\text{-}se\text{-}ns$, I see in it, not a corruption of the *i* of indicative forms like $d\tilde{u}\text{-}si\text{-}me$, "*dabimus*" (see § 652), but a corruption of the *a* of Sanskrit bases like $d\tilde{a}\text{-}sya\text{-}nt$ it is therefore identical with the *o* of the Greek $\delta\omega\text{-}\sigma\omicron\text{-}\nu\tau$; and the Lettish also actually represents by *o* this Lithuanian *e*, as to the *a*, also, of the present participle it opposes an *o*, while for the *i* of the future indicative it has, in like manner, *i*, e. g. *buhshots*, "*futurus*" = Lithuanian *busens*, *buhshoti*, "*futura*" = *busenti*, as *essots*, "being" = *esans*, feminine *essoti* = *esant* †

* See §§ 21 and 104

† The future participle in Lettish occurs only in paraphrasing the subjunctive, and the present participle also has the feminine form in *ti* only in this kind of phrase, but elsewhere *scha*, which, in my opinion, comes from *schia*, and this from *schu*, so that under the influence of the *i*, with a vowel following it, the *t* is changed into *sch*, (with *s* crossed) as in Lithuanian into *ch* (genitive *esanchiús* = Lettish *essoschas*). Refer to what has been said before (§ 783 p 1078 G ed) regarding the origin of the *trj sch* in the Slavonic gerund. The coincidence of the Lettish feminine termination *scha* with

785 The norist tenses in Sanskrit have left us no participles and the Greek language by forms like *λυσας λιτωι φυγωι τυτωι* maintains a superiority over the Sanskrit. As however the first aorist in Greek [G Ed p 1083] contains the verb substantive (see § 512) we may compare *σας σαιτα σαιτες* &c with the Sanskrit *san santam santas*. The forms which appear in composition maintain a similar superiority over the simple *ωι οϊτος* with respect to the more true preservation of the ancient form to that which the Latin *sens* of *præsens* *absens* does over the simple *ens*. In respect to the accent and the pure radical vowel Greek participles of the second aorist like *λιτωι φυγωι* opposed to *λειτωι φευγωι* answer to Sanskrit participles of the sixth class like *tudaa* pushing in accusative *tudantam*. As in the Veda-dialect many verbs occur in conjugational classes other than those which they follow in the common dialect I still hesitate to concur with Benfey in considering participles like *iridhant* increasing *dhriṣhant* daring in the weak cases *iridhat dhriṣhat* as norist participles though in no other case have the roots in question been shown to belong to the sixth class. If however they are really norist participles then we must take *dhriṣhamāna s* (Rig V I 52 5 probably to be accented *dhriṣhumāna*) also as a middle norist participle of the sixth formation though in the common dialect this formation has no indicative middle. The root *pī* to drink whence *pīāmi* (Ved *pīāmi* from *pīpīmi*) in the Veda dialect follows also the second class as is clear from *pīthā* we drink (Ved *thā* for *tha* Rig V I 86 1), whence I cannot concur with Benfey in ascribing the participle *pāntam bibentem* to the norist and just as little can I allot to it the imperative

with the Greek *σ* in forms like *τυρωισα τυρωισα* is also remarkable. This *σα* was probably preceded by a form *σια* (compare *ερα*=Sanskrit *tri* § 119) so that the *σ* was produced from *τ* by the influence of the *i* following.

páhi, “*bibe*,” which likewise belongs to the present of the second class With respect to the accentuation of the participle active present, I must further draw notice to the fact that the Greek conjugation in *μι* agrees with the corresponding Sanskrit conjugation in this (the reduplicated verbs excepted), that it accents the second syllable of the par-

[G Ed p 1084] ticiple in question, and that therefore, in this respect, *σπορνύς*, *σπορνύντα*, stand in the same relation to *φέρων*, *φέροντα*, as, in Sanskrit, *striṇuán*, *striṇuántam*, to *bháran*, *bhárantam* The Sanskrit, however, differs from the Greek in allowing, in the weakest cases (see § 130) the accent to sink down to the case-syllable, hence, *c.g.*, in the genitive singular and accusative plural *stri-ṇwa-tás* opposed to *σπορ-νύ-ντος*, *σπορ-νύ-ντας*. The Sanskrit differs from the Greek also in this, that in the accentuation of the present participle (the theory of the weakest cases excluded) it is governed by that of the corresponding tense, thus, *bódh-a-n*, *tud-á-n*, *śúchyan*, *chór-áya-n*, according to *bódh-á-mi*, *tud-á-mi*, *śúch-yá-mi*, *chór-áyá-mi*. In the second conjugation (see § 493) the present participle is governed with respect to its accent by the heavy terminations, especially by that of the third person plural, and, in irregular verbs, participates also in the abbreviations, hence from *vás'mi*, “I will,” comes not *vásant*, but *uśánt*, “willing,” according to the analogy of *uśmás*, *ushthá*, *uśánti* The third class has, as well in the entire singular (with few exceptions) as in the third person plural and in the participle present, the accent on the syllable of reduplication, hence *dádāmi*, “I give,” *dúdati*, “they give” (see § 459), *dádat*, “giving,” *m* (see § 779. Note), the latter opposed to the Greek *δίδους*, *τιθίς*, while *dádāmi*, *dádāmi*, agree with *δίδωμι*, *τίθημι*.

Remark The principle of Sanskrit accentuation appears to me to be this, that the farther the accent is thrown back, the graver and more

powerful the accent, and I believe I may assert the same principle in Greek also only that here out of regard for the harmony and euphony of the word the accent in polysyllabic words cannot [G Ed p 1080] overstep the limit of the last syllable but two while the Sanskrit places the accent on the first syllable without reference to the extent of the word, and contrasts *e g* *blarāmāḥ* with the Greek *φερμαθα*. A very striking proof of the dignity and energy of the accentuation of initial parts of words and at the same time a very remarkable point of agreement between Sanskrit and Greek accentuation is afforded by the circumstance that both languages, in the declension of monosyllabic words in the strong cases (see § 129) which, with respect to their accentuation are as it were pointed out by the genius of the language as the most important, lay the accent on the base but in the weak cases allow it to fall on the case termination. Here however the accusative plural though in respect to sound it belongs to the weak cases yet passes as regards accent in most monosyllabic words in Sanskrit as in Greek for a strong case * which cannot surprise us as this case in the singular and dual belongs in each respect to the strong cases. Compare the declension of *each* fem speech voice with the Greek *ον* (from *For* for *For* Latin *ioc*)

SINGULAR			PLURAL		
SANSKRIT		GREEK	SANSKRIT		GREEK
N V	<i>īak</i>	N V <i>ψ</i>	N V	<i>īāchas</i>	N V <i>πς</i>
Acc	<i>īicham</i>	Acc <i>π</i>	Acc	<i>īāci as</i>	Acc <i>π as</i>
Instr	<i>īachi</i>		Instr	<i>īagbhīs</i>	
Dat	<i>īāci ē</i>		D Abl	<i>īagbhy is</i>	
Gen Abl	<i>īachas,</i>	Gen <i>ονς</i>	Gen	<i>īacham</i>	Gen <i>πω</i>
Loc	<i>īachi</i>	D <i>ον ι</i>	Loc	<i>īakshu</i>	Dit <i>οψι</i>
DUAL					
SANSKRIT			GREEK		
N A V	<i>īachāu</i>	Ved <i>īachā</i>	N A V	<i>πς</i>	
I D A	<i>īagbhyām</i>		D G	<i>π</i>	
Gen Loc	<i>īāchas</i>				

I consider as a consequence of the emphasis which [G Ed p 1080] lies in the accentuation of the beginning of a word the circumstance that

* See the exceptions in Bohtlingk *A first attempt as to the Accent in Sanskrit* (St Petersburg 1843) § 14

active verbs, to which the middle verbs also belong, in Sanskrit principally accent the first syllable, so that, therefore, the energy of the action is represented by the energy of the accentuation, and I perceive an agreement of the Greek accentuation with the Sanskrit in this, that Greek verbs throw back the accent as far as possible. In dissyllabic and trissyllabic forms, therefore, the two languages usually agree most fully in their accentuation of verbs. Compare εἶμι with *émi*, δίδωμι with *dadami*, τίθημι with *dádhiami*, φέρομεν with *bhárāmas*, ἐφερον with *ábharām*. In forms of more than three syllables the Greek approaches the Sanskrit as closely as, without a violation of the fundamental law of its system of accentuation, is possible, hence the already-mentioned φερόμεθα compared with *bhárāmahé* (from *-madhé*, see § 472), and also ἐφερόμεθα compared with *ábharāmahí*. A quite similar agreement, together with a similar contrast, appears between the Greek and Sanskrit accentuation in cases in which the Greek, in accordance with the Sanskrit principle, throws back the accent of the base word in the vocative.* This evidently happens, in both languages, in order to give emphasis to the name of the person called, and to bring it prominently forward by the voice, and in the vocative of the three numbers in all words, the Sanskrit (where this case is specially accented) always accents the first syllable, however long the word may be, and wherever the accent may fall in the other cases. To the nominatives *pitá*, *mátá*, *dúhitá* (acc *pitáam*, *mátáam*, *dúhitáram*), correspond the vocatives *pítai*, *mátar*, *dúhitai*, with which the corresponding Greek vocatives *πάτερ*, *μήτερ*, *θύγατερ*—as compared with *πατήρ*, *πατέρα*, *μήτηρ*, (for *μητήρ*) *μητέρα*, *θυγάτηρ* (for *θυγατήρ*), *θυγατέρα*,—stand in surprising agreement, and this is the more remarkable, as the words denoting affinity in our family of languages belong, in other respects also, to those expressions which have preserved the ancient stamp with astonishing fidelity. While, however, the Sanskrit also exhibits vocatives like *vísramitá*, the Greek, owing to accentual limits prescribed to it, can only shew such as *Ἀγάμεμνον*, which, however, does not prevent us from re-

[G Ed p 1087] cognising, even in forms of this kind, the agreement of the Greek and Sanskrit vocative theory, and just as little, in my opinion, could forms like φερόμεθα compared with the Skr *bhárāmahé* cause us to overlook the affinity of Greek and Sanskrit verbal accentuation. The principal part of the Sanskrit first conjugation (see § 493) is formed by the first class, which comprehends almost one half of the whole number of roots, and

* Compare Benfey in the "*Halle Journal of General Literature*," May this, 1897

to which with few exceptions all the German strong verbs belong (see § 10.) I p 110 G ed) thus in the special tenses throughout accent the first syllable. The sixth class which is properly only an offshoot of the first and contains as it were the disjunct members of that class (about 140 roots) has with the Guna put off all the accenting of the radical vowel and accents instead the class vowel only that the augment as well in the imperfect as in the aorist in all classes of verbs has the accent, hence *tudāmi tudāsi tudāsi* 'tundes' opposed to *bodhāmi, scio bodhāsi scis*. The jative accents its characteristic *ya* and therefore the second syllable instead of the first, undoubtedly because in it the energy of self exertion is lost this is evident from the fact that verbs of the fourth class though their middle is literally the same as the jative, nevertheless accent the first syllable hence *sucyate purificat* opposed to *sucyate purificatur*. It is also of some importance for the support of my view of the meaning of Sanskrit accentuation that when the passive is used as reflexive the accent may be thrown back on the radical syllable though only in roots terminating in a vowel or which drop their final consonant. Dideratives and intensives excepting the dependent of the latter as is natural from the energy inherent in them hold fast to the general principle of throwing back the accent as far as possible hence *pīpādmi*.

I wish to drink *bibhādmi* I cleave (intens.) As to the fact however, that verbs of the tenth class though they Gunaize the radical syllable, still throw the accent on the second (*chorayāmi* I steal not *chayāmi*) we may suppose that these verbs still feel themselves to be compound, and in a measure determinatives and as such in accordance with the prevailing principle of compounds accent the last member of the compound,* but the first syllable of it in order to comply with the fundamental rule of verbal accentuation. The same syllable in my opinion [C I d p 1008] now is accented in denominatives formed by *ya* for the same reason (*putrigate*). I consider it as another consequence of the composition that the auxiliary future accents not the first syllable of the whole compound but the auxiliary verb whether it begins with the second or the third syllable of the whole expression while the Greek, through all tenses retains the fundamental principle of verbal accentuation hence *δωσω* *δωσωμεν* compared with *δίξω δίξωμεν* and forms like *ταύσιν* *ταύσιν* (*extenlam*) *ταύσιν* *ταύσιν*. So in Sanskrit the auxiliary verb, which is added in the potential (optative) and precativ (nom of the potential = optative) viz the syllable *yī* draws the accent upon itself hence *da*

dyát, “*det*” (*διδόη*), pīcative *dēyāt* (*δοή*), *bhūyāma*, “*simus*” * On the other hand, in cases where the modal element coalesces with the preceding class-vowel into a diphthong, the accent remains on the same syllable as is accented in the indicative, thus, *bhārās*, *bhāret*, *bhāreṃa*=*phēpōis*, *phēpōi*, *phēpōiṃen* on the other hand, *tudēs*, *tudet*, &c, according to the analogy of *tudāsi*, *tudāti*. The analogy of the sixth class is followed by the potentials of the aorist of the sixth formation peculiar to the Veda-dialect, hence, ‘*akēma*, “*possimus*”

In the six classes of verbs belonging to the Sanskrit second conjugation (see § 493), as also in the perfect of all verbs, the heavy personal terminations exercise a similar influence on the attraction of the accent to that manifested in Greek in all classes of words by the length of the final syllable, only that the heavy personal terminations in Sanskrit not only attract the accent, but appropriate it, and, if dissyllabic, to their first syllable. In this way *ēmi* (= *εἶμι*), *dādāmi* (= *δίδωμι*), *jaḥāmi*, “I abandon,” are in the plural *imās*, *dadmās* (for *dadāmās*, middle *dudmāhi*, † *jaḥimās*). In the fifth, seventh, eighth, and ninth class, as also in the perfect, the Guna syllable, or the heavier class affix or insertion, ex-

[G Ed p 1089] ercises an influence in removing the accent, hence, *chínōmi*, “I collect” (plural *chinumās*), *yunājmi*, “I unite” (plural *yuiñmas*), *tanōmi*, “I extend” (plural *tanumās*), *yunāmi*, “I bind” (plural *yunīmās*), *tutōda*, “I did thrust” (plural *tutudima*), instead of the forms *chínōmi*, *yúnajmi*, &c, which, according to the fundamental principle of verbal accentuation, would be looked for. The heavy suffix of the participle present (*nt*, *ant*), the *a* of which, just like that of the third person plural, is viewed, with respect to the accentuation, as an essential portion of the termination, or of the suffix, follows, in the just mentioned verbal classes, the analogy of the heavy personal terminations, especially that of the third person plural, but in the weak cases (with the exception of verbs of the third class) allows the accent to fall down to the cast-termination, and the feminine *ī*, in case the suffix loses its *n*, follows the analogy of the weakest cases. The same principle governs the par-

* Sâma Vêd II 6 2 16 2. Remark the dropping of the *s* of the common dialect (*bhūyāsma*), as in Zend, see § 701.

† Reduplicated roots accent only those heavy terminations which begin with a consonant, and accord to those commencing with a vowel no influence in casting back the accent. The vowel *a*, which precedes *n* in the third person plural, is viewed as regards the accentuation as belonging to the personal termination. Hence *yanti*, “they go,” compared with *ēti*, but *dadati*, “they give” (see § 459) not *dadāti*, like *dadāti*, “he gives”

ticiple present of the sixth class I annex the nominative accusative and genitive singular masculine (the genitive being also neuter) and the feminine nominative in *r* which is identical with the theme of the roots *duḥ* *h* to hate C 2 *da* to give C 3 *yuj* to join C 7 *chr* "to collect C 5 *tan* to extend C 8 *yu* to bind C 9 *tud* to thrust C 6 *dwishan dwishantam dwishatas dwishati dadat dadatam dadatas da dati yuñjan yuñjantam yuñjatas yuñjati chinwan chinwantam chinwatás chinuati tanwán tanuántam tanwata tanuati yunan yunántam yunatas, yunati tundán tundantam tundatás tundánti*—As in Greek present active participles of the conjugation in *μ* in agreement with the prevailing principle in the corresponding Sanskrit conjugation accent the vowel which precedes the *v* instead of the first of the base word, and e.g. *στροφ* *ς* *στ* *pv* *vta*, *στροφ* *vt* *στροφvvt* *ς* stand for comparison with the Sanskrit *strinwan strinwántam st inuanti* (in the Veda dialect) *st inuántas* it might be conjectured that originally the heavy personal terminations as they exercise (see § 480) as in Sanskrit a shortening influence on the preceding syllable have also in like manner attracted to themselves the accent Then the Doric forms *δδ* *vri* *τιθ* *vt* *ισταντι* *δει* *vurti* might be regarded as remnants of an older system of accentuation In the opposite case we must look upon Sanskrit forms like *strinomás* compared with the Greek *στ* *propev* as the consequence of an influence upon the accentuation exercised by the heavy personal terminations and first accorded to them by the genius of the language after the separation of languages I have no doubt that forms like *strinomi* (for *starnomi* = [G Ed p 1090] *στ* *p* *μ*) *yundymi* through the influence of the weight of the second syllable first after the separation of languages transferred the accent from the first to the second syllable Thus takes place also in some verbs of the third class which we find therefore in this respect as it were in the period of transition from the original system of accentuation to that more recent in which in the second principal conjugation the weight of the second syllable has made its influence felt upon the accentuation However in the Veda dialect in those roots also which admit the accentuation of the radical syllable the accenting of the syllable of reduplication seems principally to prevail Benfey (*Glossary to the Sama Veda* p 13J) cites from *bhar* *bri* Class 3 the forms *bibharshi* *fers* *bibhrate* *ferenti* *bibhrati* *ferentes* (as Vedic pl fem for *b* *bhratyas*) opposed to *bibharti* *fert* *

* We must not infer from *bibharti* and similar forms that *ar* is really the Guna of *ri* it is natural however in parts of grammar where vowels capable of Guna receive it that those verbs which admit of weakening should preserve the full form of the root as *tas* to will be

[G Ed. p. 1091] A strong proof of the emphasis of the accentuation of the beginning of words (in Sanskrit always of the first syllable) is afforded in Sanskrit and Greek by the suffixes of the degrees of comparison, ईयांस् *īyāns* (in the weak cases *īyas*), ἰον, ἔϋ *ishtha*, ἰστο, which, where they are added, always require the accent to be thrown back as far as possible. Thus, in Sanskrit, from *suādū*, “sweet=ḥḍū, comes the comparative *suādīyāns*, nominative masc *suādīyān*, and the superlative *suādīshtha-s*. To the latter the Greek ἥδιστο-s corresponds, and to the nominative and accusative neuter of the comparative *suādīyas* the Greek ἥδιον, while ἥδιον, ἥδιονος, for well-known reasons, do not exhibit an agreement of accentuation with *suādīyān*, *suādīyasas*. The Greek degrees of comparison in *τερο*, *τατο*, follow essentially the same principle, i.e. they throw the accent as far back as possible, by which, however, only the syllable preceding the suffix is reached, so that, as compared with the positive, the accent is often necessarily transferred from the beginning to the middle of a word, as in *βεβαιότερος*, *βεβαιότατος*, compared with *βεβαιος*. In Sanskrit, on the other hand, the degree suffixes, corresponding to the Greek *τερο*, *τατο*, exercise no influence at all on the accent, and the positive base retains the accent on the base on whatever part of the word soever the same may fall,

comes contracted to *us* only in places which do not allow of Guna, hence, *uśmās*, “we will,” opposed to *uśmi*, “I will” (Comp Vocalismus, p. 158). When Benfey, who, in the “*Halle Journal of General Literature*” (May 1845, p. 944) contrasts the Greek ὀρνυμι with the Sanskrit *rinómi*, remarks, that in Greek *ri* is Gunized, because it is accented, and that *u* is for the same reason Gunized in Sanskrit, I cannot assent to him in either point. In the first place, I recognise in forms like ὀρνυμι, στήρνυμι (the latter = *stinómi*), no Guna, but only the discontinuance of the abbreviation of *u* to *ri*, which was admitted in Sanskrit, just as in *τρίτος* compared with the Sanskrit *trītiyas* (Latin *tertius*, transposed from *tretius*, for *tritius*), the abbreviation of the syllable *ri* has ceased. In the second place, I cannot admit that forms like *rinómi*, *stinómi*, have Gunized the second syllable because it is accented, for if the accent occasioned the Guna, we should also expect for *bhébharshu* and *vévakti* (in the Veda-dialect), *bhébharshu*, *vévakti*, and for desideratives like *pípāsāmi*, *pépāsāmi*. To me, therefore, the principle set forth above, viz. that the accenting of the first syllable belongs to the verb, but that heavy syllables have often destroyed the original accentuation, and appropriated the accent to themselves, appears far more natural. The Greek replaces the Guna of *rinómi*, *stinómi*, by the lengthening of the vowel (στήρνυμι opposed to στήρνυμεν), but nevertheless preserves the original accentuation.

thus the comparative and superlative of *mahat* (in the strong cases *mahānt*) are in the nominative masculine *mahattaras mahattamas* and the superlative of *vrīhan* liberal giving freely ' (in the Veda dialect) is *vrīshantama s* genitive *vrīhantamasya* (Rig V I 1 10) The reason that *tara* and *tama* in Sanskrit exercise no influence on the accentuation lies in my opinion in this that the *e* suffixes are rather enclitic in their nature and have not grown up so inwardly united with the principal word as the other more rare suffixes of comparison, as appears also from the circumstance that the feminine accusatives *taram tamam* may be added also to verbs adverbially *eg vadatitamam* he speaks very much

A consequence of the emphasis which lies in accenting the beginning of a word is this that abstract substantives which frequently are merely intensifications of adjectives affect in Sanskrit and in Greek this kind of accent Thus the suffix *as* in Sanskrit is used especially in forming abstracts and requires an accent on the first syllable of the word as in *yīyas* neuter glory compared with *yāyas* glorious (the latter only in the Veda dialect see Benfey's Glossary) whence the comparative *yasastara s* superlative *yasastama s* thus *opus* neuter acti [G Ed p 1022] *vīty* work ' offering (Latin *opus*) compared with *opīs* masculine active warrior sacrificer As Greek bases in *οσ* *ε(σ)* or correspond to Sanskrit neuter bases in *as* (see § 178) Benfey draws our notice as regards the paroxytone accent of the abstracts spoken of and the oxytone accent of the adjectives to the relation of the Greek *γρ* to *γης* It may also be observed that Greek bases in *εσ* when they form possessive compounds in combination with preceding words usually throw the accent on the suffix while other compounds of this kind accent the first member of the compound or at least throw back the accent as far as possible thus *ερσθη μεγαλοσθενεσ μυγαθαρσνεσ δυσκλνεσ κλενεσ* compared with forms like *μεγθμοσ μεγθωροσ μεγλθωρσ μεγαλυθξσ αολμρψσ αιλδτπλσ αιλοχιτησ*

786 The suffix of the participle of the reduplicated preterite or perfect (see § 585) is in Sanskrit in the paradigm *upadam* or active (see § 126) according to the difference of case *īas īat īah* and in all these forms according to the analogy of the heavy terminations of the indicative (see p 1089 G ed) has the accent Indian Gramarians however consider *īas* as the true form of the suffix though it does not appear in this form in a single

case, but the strong cases spring from *vāns*,* the middle

[G Ed p 1093] from *vāt*, and the weakest from *ūsh* (euphonic for *us*). From *ūsh* comes also the feminine theme *ūshī*, to which the Lithuanian *usi* is an admirable counterpart, hence, e g., *degusi*, "having burned," f. = Sanskrit *dēhūshī* for *daduhushī* (see §. 605). The oblique cases of the Lithuanian feminine participle spring, for the most part, from an extended base *-usia*, hence the genitive singular *degusio-s*, as *ranko-s*, from *ranká*, "hand." Compare herewith the Greek *υα* of *τετυφύα*, which has been already elsewhere compared with the Sanskrit *tutupūshī* †

787 With the weakest form of the Sanskrit participial suffix above mentioned are connected also, in Lithuanian, the oblique cases of the masculine, but with the same inorganic affix *ia*, which, too, the participle present has received, thus, genitive *degusio* (as *wilko* from *wilka-s*) corresponding to the Sanskrit *dēhūsh-as*, dative *deg-usia-m*, ‡ accusative *deg-usi-ñ* for *deg-usia-ñ*. The nominative *degeis* is based on the Sanskrit strong theme *dēh-i-vāns* (i as conjunctive vowel), but the *s* of the Lithuanian form scarcely belongs to the base, but is the sign of case, and extends, as in

* The vocative singular, which in general disclaims long vowels (see § 205), shortens the long *ā*, hence, *van* compared with the nominative *vān*, since *Anuswāna* (*n*) after the *s* is dropped (see § 9) becomes *n*. I am not inclined with Bohtlingk (Deel p 10) to represent *vans* as the original form of the suffix, for if, as we ought to be, we are guided by the strong cases, which in general, where different modifications of the theme occur, have preserved the original form, we must then take *vāns* to be the ancient form, and allow that the vocative, as is its wont, has shortened the vowel, which perhaps is only a consequence of emphasizing the beginning of the word in the vocative by accenting it. Bohtlingk also, in his zeal for the vocative, represents *īyans* as the theme of the comparative suffix *īyāns*, *īyas* (see § 298), the long *ā* of which, in Latin, takes the form of *ō* in all the oblique cases

† "On the Influence of Pronouns on the Formation of Words," p 4

‡ According to the analogy of the adjective declension, see § 281

the participle present to the vocative also while the Sanskrit as it cannot bear two consonants at the end of a word (see § 91) in both cases abandons both the nominative sign and the final consonant of the base thus nominative *dih i idn* vocative *dih i ian* corresponding to the Lithuanian *deg ens**. The Zend on the contrary [G Ed p 1094]

* In the Old Prussian Catechism there occur two perfect participles in *icuns* very deserving of notice viz *klant icuns* 'having cursed' and *murra icuns* 'having murmured' which stand nearer to the Sanskrit *rans* than any other European kindred form. The *u* of *icuns*, as also that of the common form *uns* (after consonants also *ons* and sometimes *ans*) is evidently like the *e* of the Lithuanian *ens* a weakening of *a* originally *ā* as in *widdeicu* 'widow' = Sanskrit *iudhar i* Latin *iudua* and some similar feminine nominatives. The *u* of the plural *us* accusative *usis* and of the accusative singular *usin* is on the other hand organic and identical with the Sanskrit *u* of the base of the weakest case and of the feminine as also with that of the corresponding forms in Lithuanian. Nesselmann (*The Language of the Old Prussians*, p 64) represents the participles in *uns* (*on ans icuns*) as indeclinable, and takes *usis* as an independent form with declinable terminations. I however consider *icuns uns ons ans* as the singular nominative masculine with *s* as the sign of case as in the Lithuanian *ens*. This participle seldom requires declension as it is principally used for a periphrasis of the perfect indicative and thus occurs in the nominative relation *e g., asma murra icuns hic klant icuns* 'I have murmured and cursed' (literally 'I am the person having murmured and cursed'). The nominative singular usually takes the place of the plural as also in Lithuanian the present and perfect participles have lost the termination of the plural nominative and in this case reject only the *s* of the nominative singular hence from *sud ens* 'having turned' comes the plural *sulen*. Where however in Old Russian the plural relation of the participle perfect is really expressed, it ends in *usis* probably from a lengthened base in *usi* (compare § 780) so that *is* corresponds to the Lithuanian plural termination *ys* of bases in *i* (*aic is* 'sheep' from the base *aici*). The examples occurring in the Old Prussian Catechism may be found in Nesselmann p 31 n 84 *madlits tyt w rstai ius ammusis laulyti tyt w rstai ious aupallusis* 'ask and ye shall receive (be having received) seek and ye shall find (be having found)'. The future which is wanting in Old Prus-

has retained the nominative sign in its participles, as, 𐬔𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬵𐬀 *dadhváo*, "having made," 𐬔𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬵𐬀 *víd-váo*, "knowing" (*ciðwós*), which it has also done in the participle present, a point in which it is superior to the Sanskrit, and agrees with the Lithuanian, Latin, and Gothic, for from 𐬔𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬵𐬀 *ván* is formed in Zend, not 𐬔𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬵𐬀 *váo*, but 𐬔𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬵𐬀 *vann*. It is clear,

[G Ed p 1095] however, that the *o* of *váo* does not represent the *s* of the theme of the strong cases, as the suffix *vant* also, in the nominative, forms *váo* (compare Burnouf *Yaçna*, Note R p 128). In the accusative, 𐬔𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬵𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬵𐬀 *dadhvâñhēm* corresponds to the Sanskrit *dadh-i-vâñsam*, in the weakest cases, and before the feminine character *i*, the Zend suffix is contracted, like the Sanskrit suffix, to *ush*,* hence, in the genitive 𐬔𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬵𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬵𐬀 *dathushô* (Vend. S p 3, for *dadhushô*,

sian is always periphrastically expressed by the auxiliary verb signifying "to be," with the perfect participle; hence, p 12, n 15., *pergûhous usyt*, "he is come" (is the person having come). The oblique cases of the perfect participle, from being little required, seldom occur, and spring likewise from the theme increased by *i*, while the Lithuanian adds *ia* to the base. The only instances that occur are, *au-lau-ûsi-ns*, "the slain" (*mortuos*, for which, also, *aulausins* and *aulauwussens*), and *anan-gimm-usi-n*, "to those born in (the place)", the latter with passive signification, which, except in the root *gem*, *gum*, does not occur in this participle. If we should not admit a nominative plural in *usis*, the above-mentioned forms might then be taken as singular nominatives, with a plural signification. The circumstance, however, that the real and frequently-occurring singular nominative always terminates in *ns*, and that, too, the participle present leaves the old base (in *nt*) in the nominative singular unextended, and in the other cases extended only by *i*, is much opposed to this view. — The single feminine form of this participle which occurs deserves mention; viz the nominative singular *aulausé*, "*mortua*," for *aulauusé*, as above *aulau-sms* together with *aulauusins*. The final *é* corresponds, therefore, to the Sanskrit *i* and Lithuanian *i* of feminine forms in *ushí*, *usi*.

* The lithographed Codex of the Vendidad Sâdê has, almost in all places, 𐬔𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬵𐬀 *s* for 𐬔𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬵𐬀 *sh*. I, however, agree with Burnouf in reading 𐬔𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬵𐬀 *sh* as probably the sole correct reading (see § 51)

see p 96o Note †) in the dative 𐬵𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬵𐬀𐬭𐬀 *vidushê* to the knowing (l c p 214) = 𐬵𐬀𐬭𐬀 *vidushê* (*ειδοτι*) in the genitive plural 𐬵𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬵𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬵𐬀𐬭𐬀 *iririthushanm* of the dead (l c p 101) in the genitive singular feminine 𐬵𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬵𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬵𐬀𐬭𐬀 *jaghmushyâo* (l c p 91 twice and p 304 [G Ed p 1006] twice)* = Sanskrit *jaghmushyâs* from *gam* to go in the accusative feminine 𐬵𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬵𐬀𐬭𐬀 *uthushim* = Sanskrit *vidushim* from *vid* to know (l c p 469)

789 With the contracted form 𐬵𐬀 *ush* of the suffix here spoken of is connected a word which appears in Gothic as a solitary remnant of an obsolete participial gender and corresponds in a remarkable manner with Sanskrit forms like *dihush* (theme of the weakest cases) from *dah* I mean *berusjâs* the parents occurring only in the nominative plural masculine and which I have no doubt properly signifies the living given birth to and with respect to its radical vowel corresponds to the polysyllabic forms of the preterite of *baira* (*bar* plural *berum* subjunctive singular *ber yau* plural *bêr ei ma* (see § 60o)) The theme is *berusya* which corresponds in its inorganic affix *ya* to the above mentioned (§ 787) Lithuanian *ia e g* of *deg usia* dative *deg usia m* The nominative singular according to § 135 would be *bêr useis* and the accusative *bêrusi* the latter like the Lithuanian *degusi n* from the base *degusia*

* With regard to the long *u* of *jaghmushyâo* let it be noticed that the sibilant is here followed by a semi vowel since as it appears a lengthening of the *u* which is in Sanskrit always short occurs especially before two consonants, hence also Vendicid Side p 51o 𐬵𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬵𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬵𐬀𐬭𐬀 *jaghmu, temô* (with *as* for *us*) a superlative formed from the weakest theme and p 52o *dad izhibis* an interesting form whence it is clear that in Zend also the middle cases (see § 130) of this participle spring from the weakest theme There occurs however a long *u* in *pipyushim* without the occasion of two following consonants as also in its negative *apipyushim* (Vend S p 429) from *p* to drink with a causal meaning (having suckled f) Perhaps the circumstance that two consonants precede has here its influence

789. To the form *vât*, whence come in Sanskrit the middle cases of the perfect participle,* belongs the Greek *ότ*, which has preserved the ancient accent (see §. 786.), but after losing the digamma, which is generally lost in the middle of words, in case it does not assimilate with a preceding con-

[G Ed p 1097] sonant (see *τέσσαρες*, § 312 p 410 G ed), as, for instance, also in the suffix *cvτ*=Sanskrit *vant* (of the strong cases) thus, the same relation that *ἀμπλό(F)cvτ* has to Sanskrit forms like *dhāna-vant* ("endowed with riches," see § 20), *ττυφ(F)ότ* has to *tutupuât*, to which, as nominative, accusative, and vocative neuter, *ττυφός* corresponds in Greek (see § 152 p 179 G. ed.). To the plural locative *tutup-uât-su* the Greek dative *ττυφ-ό(τ)-σι* corresponds. Mention has already been made of the feminine form in *uîa*, as abbreviation of *usia*, and of the affinity, as regards formation, of *ττυφuîa* with the Sanskrit *tutupûhî* (see § 786). The Latin, perhaps, in *secûri-s* presents a remnant of these feminine participles in *ushî* (euphonic for *usî*), and the proper translation, therefore, is, perhaps, "the cutting" (instead of "the having cut"), the *u* being lengthened, and the sibilant being changed, as is usual, between two vowels into *r*†. As several participial suffixes are often used also in the formation of derivative words, there is, therefore, ground for comparing the suffix *ôsu* in words like *lapid-ôsus*, *lumin-ôsus*, *fluctu-ôsus*, *form-ôsus*, *pisc-ôsus*, with the Sanskrit *vân*, or the strong cases, to which it has nearly the same relation that the comparative suffix *vôr* has to *इयांस* *îyâns* (see §. 298),

* See § 130, where it must be also noticed that the nominative, accusative, and vocative singular of neuters in the threefold theme gradation are always connected with the middle form

† See § 22. In the Vêda-dialect there are abstract substantives in *ushî*, with the accent on the radical syllable (see p 1091 G ed), as, *tâpushî*, "ne" (properly, "the burning"), from *tap*, "to burn," *târushî*, "strife," from *tar* (*trî* तृ), "to pass over"

only that the original sibilant is retained though the *v* is lost just as in *sopio* = *suapimi* *soro sordrem* = *swasdr suasiram sol* = *swar* heaven (from *sur* and this from *suar* to shine) Zend *hware* the sun With respect to the prolongation of the suffix by a vowel affix compare the relation of the suffix *uru* to *tor*, Sanskrit *tar* (see § 617)

790 In Old Slavonic the gerundive preterite corresponds to the participle here spoken of is most clearly apparent in the feminine singular form in which [G Ed p 1098] in verbal bases ending in a vowel *вѣшу vshi* corresponds to the Sanskrit Zend *ushu* and Lithuanian *usi* Compare *бывѣшу by vshi* being having been (*geuesen seiend*) (feminine) with the Sanskrit *बभूवुषी babhuv ushi* and Lithuanian *buw usi* In the nominative plural masculine (used also for the feminine) *вѣше v she*—with *e* as the termination of case = Sanskrit as Greek *es*—answers to the Sanskrit *vānsas* and therefore *бывѣше by v she* to *babhu vānsas* on the other hand in the singular the sibilant is lost in the nominative masculine thus *бывѣ by v* corresponding to the Sanskrit *babhu vān* and Lithuanian *buw ens* (see § 787) where it must be observed that generally the Slavonic has lost the original final consonant so that the *s* also of the Lithuanian *buw ens* belongs not to the suffix but to the case sign After consonants the *v* of the gerundive suffix is suppressed hence *e g* *несѣ nes* having carried (for *nes-v*) plural *несѣше nes she* (for *несѣше nesv she*) feminine singular *несѣшу nes shi* (for *nes vshi*)

Remark In the Slavonic that tense of the indicative is wanting whence the past participle or gerundive has proceeded on the other hand I am now of opinion that the Lithuanian perfect (also aorist) which I formerly compared with the Sanskrit first augmented preterite (Greek imperfect) must be compared with the Sanskrit reduplicated preterite Greek perfect and Gothic preterite of the strong conjugation I assume therefore that *e g* in *bucau* I was or I have been instead of the

augment, a syllable of reduplication is dropped, as in Gothic preterites like *baug*, "I bent," *bugum*, "we bent"—Sanskrit *bubhūja*, *bubhujamā*, and I compare it with the Sanskrit *bubhūra*, to which, with regard to its medial *u*, it corresponds better than to the imperfect *abhubam*. *Buau* does indeed closely resemble also the Sanskrit aorist *ābhūam*, but in the third person *buw-o* answers better to *babhū-a* than to *ābhūt*, and in both the plural numbers the forms given above (p 762 G ed) answer better to *babhūv-i-vā* (from *-a-va*) *babhūv-a-thās* (from *-thas*), *babhū-i-mā* (from *-a-ma*), *babhūv-a-(ta)*, than to *ābhū-ia*, *ābhūtam*, *ābhū-ma*, *abhū-ta*

[G. Ed p 1099] The conjecture that the Lithuanian perfect belongs to one of the general tenses, and not to the imperfect, is also confirmed by the consideration that the imperfect in Sanskrit and Greek always takes part in the base of the present, *i e* in the class peculiarities, while the Lithuanian preterite, which is called perfect, does not, hence the perfect of *gáu-nu*, "I am acquainted with," which corresponds to Greek verbs like *ᾔσκω*, Latin like *scer-no* (see p 718 G ed), is not *gau-nau*, but *gau-aū* (future *gáu-su*). In the perfect, too, *t* or *st* of the present base is dropped, which formerly, when we sought to compare this tense with the Sanskrit-Greek imperfect, appeared a difficulty (see § 198). As to the circumstance that the *y oi i* (see p 722 G ed) compared with the Sanskrit fourth class is retained in the perfect, and that, *e q*, from *λεπην*, "I order," comes the perfect *lepyau* (future *lepsyu*), from *τρακην*, "I draw," the perfect *traukiau* (future *trauk-su*), this may be explained from the near resemblance in form of the fourth class to the tenth, in which the retention of the *y oi i* in the general tenses is regular. In general the perfect loves a *y*, and often adds one in verbs which do not exhibit one either in the present or in any other tense, as from *dūma* (for *dādmī*), or *dūdu*, "I give," comes *daw-yau* (future *dū-su*), from *demī* (for *dedmī*), "I lay," *dē-yau* (future *dē-su* = *dihā-syāmī*, *θί-σω*)*, from *eimi*, or *enu*, "I go," *ēyau* (future *ei-su* = Sanskrit *ě-shyāmī*). In every case the form of the participle may be safely inferred from that of the perfect indicative, but when the *y* of the first person singular indicative disappears in the other persons, it is lost in the participle also, thus, from *daw-yau*, second person *daw-ei*, participle *daw-ens*, feminine *daw-usi*, but from *dēyau*, second person *dēyer*, participle *dēy-ens*, feminine *dēy-usi*, from *ēyau*, "I go," second person *ēyer*, participle *ēy-ens*, feminine *ēy-usi*. It is beyond doubt,

* If the Lithuanian perfect belonged to the Sanskrit-Greek imperfect, then the perfect of *dūdu* and *dedu* would most probably be *dūdan*, *dedau* = Sanskrit *ādadām*, *ādadhām*, Greek *ἐδίδων*, *ἐτίθην*



therefore that as the participle is based on the Sanskrit in *tans* feminine *u/hu* so the preterite indicative which is most intimately connected with it must also be connected with the Sanskrit reduplicated preterite and its European kindred forms. The Old Prussian simple preterite also which in signification usually appears as aorist appears to me to be a sister form of the Sanskrit reduplicated preterite with the loss [G Ed p 1100] of the reduplication hence *dau* he gave for *da** = Sanskrit *dadau*, for *dadd*. The present *dast* from *dad t* is on the other hand like the Lithuanian *dus ti* a reduplicated form (see p 661 G ed). The *ts* which often terminates the third person singular preterite as in *dauts* he gave a form used together with *dai* *immats* he took a form coexistent with *imma* *billats* he spoke with *billa* this *ts* I regard as an appended pronoun and abbreviated for *tas* (compare Lithuanian *tas* (*der*) the and the Sanskrit base *ta* he this that). Let it be observed that in general bases in *a* for the most part suppress this vowel before the nominative signs hence *e g* *deus* God = Lithuanian *dieva s* Sanskrit *deva s* (see Nesselmann p 49). That the *ts* spoken of is not characteristic of the preterite is clear from this that it also occurs sometimes in the present for example in *astits* he is † and *po-quoitits* he desires. The former occurs twice and once indeed in the sense of the subjunctive Nesselmann, p 23 n 51 *nostan kai tans sparts astits* on that he may have power. Here therefore the idea he is three times expressed once by *tans* then by the ancient personal termination *ti* of the meaning of which the language is no longer conscious and lastly by the appended *ts*. This *ts* however can scarcely be admitted in reference to feminines therefore no neuter substantives in Old Prussian and in one place where *astits* appears to mean he is it refers to the masculine *unds* water (Nesselmann p 17) *adder sen stesmu wirdan Deucas astits and Crutisnā* but with the word of God is a baptism. Here therefore the appended pronoun as the subject of the proposition is correctly in its place.

791 The middle and passive participles in Sanskrit, in

* *i* frequently stands in Old Prussian for *a* as in the nominative singular feminine where both *a* and *ai* correspond to the Sanskrit *u* see Nesselmann p 48 and compare *quai* which? with the Sanskrit *ka* Lithuanian *ka* and Latin *quae* so *stas* (also *stā*) this, the = Lithuanian *ta*

† Compare Sanskrit *asti*, Lithuanian *esti* the *i* of which in Old Prussian is contained only in this compound (simply *ast*)

so far as they attach themselves to any tense of the indicative, have the suffix *māna* or *āna*. I consider the latter to be an abbreviation of the former, as it is represented in

[G Ed p 1101] Greek, just like *māna*, by *μενο* nor is it probable that the Sanskrit should have originally appropriated to the participle present of the middle voice two suffixes which resemble one another so closely as *māna* and *āna*, and so allot their use, that the former belongs exclusively to the first principal conjugation—only with the exception, that the tenth class, probably on account of its greater fulness of form, admits also *āna* while the latter is fixed in the second conjugation, and, moreover, in the perfect, to which, as it appears to me, on account of its incumbrance with the syllable of reduplication, the shorter form is more agreeable, where we must remark, that in the present participle active also the reduplication has an influence on the weakening of the participial suffix (see §. 779. p. 1073 G. ed Note) The auxiliary future has everywhere preserved the complete suffix *māna*, hence, *dā-syā-mā-na-s*, both middle and passive= $\delta\omega-\sigma\acute{o}-\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$ With this agrees the Lithuanian *dū-se-ma-s* (feminine *-ma*), “*qui dabitur*,” since in Lithuanian the said participial suffix has been abbreviated to *ma*, which nevertheless does not cause us to overlook its connection with the Sanskrit *māna* and Greek *μενο* In the participle present *dūd-a-ma-s*, “*qui datur*,” corresponds to the Greek $\delta\iota\delta\acute{o}-\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$, and Sanskrit *dād'-āna-s* (for *dād'-mā-nas*, and this for *dadā-māna-s*). the latter, however, is middle only, and the passive participle is दीयमानस् *dī-yā-māna-s* + The Old Prussian, which approaches the Lithuanian very closely, has, in one of the two examples of the said participle which remain to us in the translation of Luther's Catechism, preserved the origi-

* Several roots in *ā* (among them *dā*) weaken this vowel before the passive character *ya* to *i* }

nal form of the suffix with astonishing fidelity it may be said in its perfect Sanskrit form unless perhaps the *a* of the first syllable be short. The example I mean is [G. Ed. p. 1102] *po klaus i-mana s* heard or rather being heard *ακουομενος* * in form however *υποκλυομενος* would be the corresponding word is *klaus* or *klus* is the Prussian form of the Greek root *κλυ* (Sanskrit *śru* from *kru*) and *po* corresponds to the Greek *υπο* Sanskrit *upa*. Besides *poklausimanas* the Prussian Catechism presents one more form which with respect to its suffix evidently belongs in like manner to the participle passive present viz *en im u mne* agreeable properly becoming accepted as the perfect passive participle *en im ts* also signifies both accepted and acceptable †

* The present participle passive suits the passage where the expression occurs better than the perfect participle (Nesselmann p. 16) *stauidas madlas ast steismu tauan en dangon ennumwingi ble poklaus manas* such prayer is acceptable to and becoming heard (=is heard) by the Lord in heaven

* Nesselmann (p. 104) takes *enumumne* to be a typographical error though he gives no reason for this opinion. The termination *mne* does not appear to me doubtful the internal vowel is omitted as in the Latin *al u mnus Vert u mnus* (§ 478) and as in the Zend forms *bar a mnem* viz *a mnem* of which hereafter. So in Old Prussian from *kermen s* body comes the accusative *kermnem* (ul o *kermenen* and *kermenan*). This *kermens* for *kermenas* is according to its formation probably in like manner a passive participle so that properly its meaning is equivalent to created made (Sanskrit *karōmi* I make compare Latin *creo creatura*). Pott refers the Latin *corpus* and Zend *kerf s* (accusative *khrpēm* to the root *khrp kalp* which however is itself connected with *kar* (*kri*) as Pott also assumes (see my Sanskrit Glossary a. 1847 p. 84). As regards the final *e* of *enumumne* it is either an adverbial or a neuter termination. The passage wherein the expression occurs requires properly the nominative singular neuter (Nesselmann p. 24 n. 56 *sta ast labban ble d jgi enumumne prikt Dewan nousesmu pogalbenul an* this is good and acceptable before God our Saviour) as *labban* also is really a neuter,

[G Ed p 1103] 792. With respect to accent the participles, middle and passive, in Sanskrit, in *māna*, *āna*, follow the same principle as the active participles (see p. 1089 G ed), i.e. they are governed by the accent of the corresponding tense in the indicative, so that the suffix receives the accent only in cases in which the indicative has it on the personal termination, which happens in the heavy terminations of the present of the second principal conjugation (with the exception of the third class, see p. 1088 G ed.) and of the perfect of all verbs. The Greek corresponds, in forms like *τετυμ-μένος* (opposed to *τυπτόμενος*), to the accentuation of the Sanskrit cognate forms, only that the latter have the accent on the final syllable of the suffix, so that *tutup-ānās* corresponds to the Greek *τετυμ-μένος*.*

neuter, according to the analogy of Sanskrit neuters in *am* (see § 152) If, however, *enimumne* is a neuter, in that case the *e* stands, as frequently happens in Old Prussian, for *a*, and the case-sign is suppressed, as in the pronominal neuters, *sta*, "this," *ka*, "what" (accusative *ka* and *kan*), and in Lithuanian neuters, as *gera*, "bonum" (§ 135) If, however, there is a typographical error in this word, which is an isolated one of its kind, we might perhaps conjecture *enimumnem*=*mnan* As regards the vowel *u*, it is probably, like the Latin *u* of *al-u-mnus*, *Vit-u-mnus*—for which we might have expected *al-i-m(i)nus*, *Vit-i-m(i)nus*—the corruption of an original *a*, and corresponds to the Sanskrit *a* of the first and sixth class (§ 109^a 1)

* At the time when the Sanskrit suffix *āna* had not yet lost its *m*, it will probably have had, like the Greek *-μένος* of *τετυμ-μενος*, the accent on the first syllable, for that the circumstance of the suffix beginning with a consonant or a vowel may have an influence on the accentuation is clear from this, that the verbs of the third class in the present indicative have the accent only on those heavy terminations which begin with a consonant, while in cases where the heavy termination begins with a vowel, the syllable of repetition is accented (see p 1088 G ed) hence, *bibhri-vāhē*, "we two carry" (Mid), but second person *bibhri-āthē*, third person *bibhri-ātē*, so also in the participle present middle *bibhri-āna*, not *bibhri-ānā* it is highly probable, however, that *bibhri-mānā* would be said if the *m* of the suffix were retained

793 In Old Slavonic the participial suffix in question has experienced the same abbreviation as in [G Ed p 1104] Lithuanian: it is in the nominative masculine *m̃s m* feminine *m̃a ma* neuter *mo ma* and as in Lithuanian has only a passive signification but occurs solely in the present. Compare *bežom̃s vež-o m* being conveyed in feminine *bežom̃a vež-o ma* neuter *bežomo vež o mo* * with the Lithuanian *vez-a ma s* feminine *-ma* the Sanskrit *rah-a-māna s ā a m* the Greek *εχ ο μαι ο s -η ο :* and the Latin *veh i- mini* (see § 478) In the German languages this participle as such has disappeared but the Gothic *lauh mōni* the lightning properly that which lights from the feminine base *lauh monyo*† is a substantive remnant of the participle present middle and therefore the *y* is an inorganic affix otherwise *mōnō* would correspond admirably to the Sanskrit feminine suffix *mānā* as *o* is the most common representative of the *ā* which is wanting in Gothic (see § 69) The nominative form *mōni* of *mōnyō* is to be explained according to § 120 †

794 The Zend has either shortened or rejected the middle *a* of the Sanskrit suffix *māna* and weakened the preceding class vowel *a* usually to *ē*. The form *mana* (*mna*) becomes as it were the step of transition to the Greek *μενο* and Latin *minu* (§ 478 p 690 G ed) and is identical

* It needs perhaps no remark that the vowel which precedes the *n* in all the languages here compared belongs to the class syllable and is therefore not to be referred to the participial suffix (see § 107 p 733 G ed)

† Sanskrit *roch a mānā* shining *f* from the root *ruch* (from *ruk*) which is only used in the middle according to the first class (see § 109 p 110 G ed) The Latin *luceo* is based on the causal form *rochayami* (see p 121 G ed)

+ It may also be assumed that the Gothic *monyo moni* is based on a to be presupposed Sanskrit form *nani* as bases in *a* especially in substantives form their feminines frequently in *i* as *dēvi* a goddess from *dēva* a god Thus *i* must in Gothic according to § 120 take the form of *yo* or *ein*, nominative *i*, *ei*

[G Ed p 1106] bute the forms *barěnněm* and *vazěnněm* into

† Vend S, p 482 *Narô unhên ashavanô huvôyazasta nyâsčmnô yêzmnô Ahuramazdanm*, “*Viri sint puri, lævam manum habentes (lævâ manu tenentes), celebrantes, venerantes Ahuramazdam*” Anquetil translates (p 416) *Qu il n’y ait que l’homme pure qui coupe le Bai som, et que,*

barēmn em and *vazemñ ěm* as bases which end in a consonant have in the accusative *ēm* as their termination. That however in general in Zend the suffix spoken of has not lost its final *a* is shown by forms like *vazemna* (Vend S p 521) which as nonnative plural can belong only to a base in *a* (§ 231 p 265 G ed Note) thus *csayamana* (I c p 543) = Sanskrit *kṣhayamānās* from *kṣhi* to rule *csayamnāo* plural feminine (I c p 550) *frāy(a)remnananm* genitive plural = Sanskrit *prayamānānām* from *यज् yaj* to honor to sacrifice. An example of a form in *ana* (for *māna*) in the second principal conjugation is *us-ana* (I c p 513) as nonnative plural for the Sanskrit *usānās* from *vas* to wish with an irregular contraction of the syllable *ia* to *u*. The following are examples of participles of the futuro passive *անհայանա* *anhayamana* or *mna* about to be born (Vend S pp 28 and 103)* and *սմբարանա* *u-dākhayamna* being about to be raised up' = Sanskrit *uddhāsyamāna* (Vend S p 89 see § 669)

795 In close connection with the participial suffix *māna* stands the Sanskrit suffix *man* the original form of which appears to be *mān* which has remained in the strong cases. The words formed with it have like the kindred participles either an active or a passive signification some are abstract substantives like the Greek formations in *μνη* (*φλεγμοιη* *χαρμοιη* *πεισμοιη* *πλησμοιη* *πημοιη* *φεισ μοιη*) which in form are essentially identical with the participial feminines in *μνη* as *e* and *o* are originally one (§ 3)

le tenant de la main gauche il fusse : eschnē a Ormu d I consider *ny : emno* as an abbreviation of *ny yās* and refer as regards the root *yas* to p 963 Note

* See § 668 where however we should read *անհայանա* *an/ya* for *անհայանա* *zan/ya* and the remark at the end of the paragraph on the incorrectness of the way in which the word is written must be cancelled and the *n* of the participial forms referred to be really regarded as an euphonic alteration of the *n* of the root *յան zan*

and with regard to the accentuation of the last syllable of the suffix, they agree with the Sanskrit *ánú*, *aní* (for *máná*, *máná*), of the second conjugation (see § 792. p 1103 G ed).^{*} But few masculines in *man* remain to us in Sanskrit, and these, too, are, for the most part, but rarely used. The following are examples *śúsh-man*, "fire," as "that which dries" *śúsh-man*, "the hot time of year," as "burning," *véman*, "weaver's loom," as "weaving or apparatus of weaving," *sáman*, "border," as "binding," from *śam*, "to bind," with the *i* lengthened, *pápmān*, "sin," as "that which is sinned" (*peccatum*), from a lost root. Some masculines in *man* have a vowel of conjunction *i*; as, *har-i-mán*, "time," as "carrying away," "destroying," *sar-i-mán*, "the wind," as "moving itself," "blowing," *dhar-i-mán*, "form," as "borne," "sustained" (thus the Latin *forma*, from the root *fer*), *star-i-mán*, "bed," as "spread out" (compare *stramen*). Thus, also, the two abstracts *ján-i-man*, "birth," and *már-i-man*, "death," which are likewise masculine, but are distinguished from the other forms in *man*, with the conjunctive vowel *i*, by accenting their first syllable, thus, *ján-i-man*, *már-i-man* like *śáśhman*, &c. opposed to *harimán*, *sarimán*, *starimán*, *dharimán*, *bharimán*.†

^{*} Compare, e g, *φλεγ-μονή* with Sanskrit middle participial forms like *yuñjámā*, "binding, f" from *yuñjámā*

† See Bohtlingk, "*The Unádi Affixes*," p 58 Wilson renders *bharimán* by "nourishing," "cherishing," Bohtlingk by "maintenance" I think, however, I may venture to deduce from the accentuation that it is not an abstract substantive; for otherwiselike *máman* "death," and *jániman*, "birth," it would most probably have the accent on the radical syllable (see p 1091 G ed) The expression कुटुम्ब *kutumba*, by which, in the Unádi Book of *Káumudī*, *bharimán* is explained, according to Wilson also, signifies, not "nourishing," "cherishing" (though to the root *kutumb*, an instance of which has not yet been met with in books, the meaning "supported" (*dhitván*) is ascribed), but, amongst other things, "family," and I conjecture that *bharimán* signifies "family," in the sense of "that which is maintained."

796 In Sanskrit the neuter bases in *man* are [G Ed p 1108] much more numerous than the masculine they all have the accent on the last syllable and express partly a passive partly an active relation or are abstracts. The following are examples *dhuman* 'a house' is 'that which is made or built' from *dhā* 'to place' (*u dhā* 'to make') *artman* 'wisdom' is 'that which is gone upon' from *art* 'to go' *śman* 'a house' as 'that which is entered' from *ś* 'to enter' *sadman* 'a house' from *sad* 'to go' and 'to sit' *karman* 'deed' *factum* *varman* 'barn' is 'that which covers' *roman* 'hair' (abbreviated from *rohman*) is 'growing' *dāman* 'band' as 'binding' *sthāman* 'strength' is 'having stability' from *sthā* 'to stand' *janman* 'birth' from *jan* 'to bear' *prman* 'love' from *pri* 'to love'. The Zend furnishes the neuter bases *𐬔𐬀𐬭𐬀* *dāman* 'people' as 'created' (= Sanskrit धामन् *dhāman* 'house') *𐬔𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬔𐬀* *maesman* 'urine' (*quod mingitur* Sanskrit मूत्र *mingere*,) and *𐬔𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬔𐬀𐬭𐬀* *chashman* 'an eye' is [G Ed p 1109] 'telling' 'announcing'. The last is radically connected with the Sanskrit *chakshus* of like meaning from *chaksh* 'to see'.

797 Adjective bases in *man* are rare in Sanskrit one example is शर्मन् *śarman* 'masculine feminine neuter happy' (as neuter substantive 'happiness') the con-

tained or supported as the wife is called *bharjī* implying 'she who is to be supported' and the husband *bhartar* *bhartṛ* 'he who supports'. Wilson and Bolittink regard शर्मन् *sariman* also as an abstract substantive and the latter renders it (L c p 149) 'to bring forth' 'to bear'. The explanatory Sanskrit expression (*prasaṇa*) is however ambiguous. I have in my Glossary, assigned to it the meanings *partus partura* and *proles progenies suboles* and here where *sariman* is explained by it I would adhere to the last signification on account of the oxytone accentuation of the just mentioned expression.

* Without any root corresponding in idea. Compare the Greek *δεω*, *δ σμαρ* from *δ σμ ν* of which hereafter

nection of which with its apparent root (βίη *íar*, πλ *ízi*, "to break,") is, as regards meaning, by no means clear. In Greek, adjective bases in *μον* correspond, both as to accent and as to the non-distinction of the feminine base from that of the masculine-nenter; as, *μνήμον*, *τλήμον*, *λῆσμον*, *ἰδμον*, *φράδμον*, *ἐπιστήμον*. To the paroxytone masculine substantive bases mentioned in § 795, like *ῥύσῃσαν*, "fire," as "dying," correspond in Greek such as *πνεῦμον* ("lung," as "breathing"), *γνώμον*, *δοῖμον* ("god," "goddess," properly "shining,")* *στήμον*. With the there-mentioned tri-syllable oxytone masculine bases like *ῥαπῃσάν*, "time," as "taking away," compare *κηδεμόν*, *ἡγεμόν*. To this class, too, belong— as *c*, like *o*, is a corruption of *a*—some bases in *μέν*, viz. *ποιμέν* ("herdsman," as "causing to feed," compare *pasco* and the Sanskrit root *prá*, "to support," "to nourish"), *ἀντμέν*,† *λιμέν*, *πυθμέν* (the two latter from roots now obscured). The suffix *μών*, *μών-ος*, of *κευθμών*, *θημών*, *χειμών*, *λαιμών* (from *λαιβ-μών*), has preserved, through all the cases, the long vowel, which, in the corresponding Sanskrit suffix, is retained only in the strong cases—so, too,

[G Ed p 1110] the corresponding Latin *mōn* of the bases *seimōn*, *termōn* (= *terminus*, see §, 478 p 691 G. ed), *tēmōn*, and *pulmōn* ‡—It is also highly probable that the Latin

* It belongs to the Sanskrit root *div*, "to shine," whence *deva*, "a god;" *div*, "heaven," *divasa*, "day," &c (See Benfey, *Gr R L* II p 207)

† With respect to the T-sound in *ἀντμήν* and *σταθμών*, and which is often added to the root before the suffix *μο*, remark a similar circumstance in Sanskrit, where, before the suffixes *van*, *vanā*, and the gerundial suffix *ya*, a euphonic *t* is always added to roots which end with a short vowel, as from *ji* comes *jítwan* and *jítwanā*, "conquering," *jítya* (with prepositions preceding), "after the conquest"

‡ Compare Pott, *Etym Inq* II 594 and I 270, where *té-mo*, as well as *tig-num*, is compared with the Sanskrit R *taksh*, "*frangere, findere, fabricari*," whence, also, *takshan*, "a carpenter;" and our *Deichsel*, "a chippaxe" as "fabricated" (Old High German *dihhsila*, and Anglo-Saxon *dhuxl*), and the Old High German *dehsa* and *dehsala*, feminine,

"axe"

ho min for *ho mon* (in the old language *he mo he monis*) belongs to the Sanskrit formations in *man*. I take the *h* as has been already remarked elsewhere (*Berlin Annual Reg of Lit Crit* Nov 1830 p 791 compare Pott *Etymological Inquiries* I p 217 and Benfey *Gr R L* ' II p 105) to be the representative of the *f* of *fui* &c and therefore *ho is* = *fū* in *fū re fu rem*. Let reference be made to the Prakrit *homi* and *havāmi*. *Inu* for the Sanskrit *bhūmi* and the dative termination *hi* of *mihī* compared with the Sanskrit *hyam* from *bhyam* (see § 215 and § 23 at the end). *Man* therefore according to the Latin expression is simply the being one as in Sanskrit *jana* the born (root *jan* to produce" to bear). There is also in Sanskrit an appellation of man from *√ blu* to be viz. *bhūmana* (see Wilson) and two appellations of the earth viz *bhū* (the simple root) and *bhūmi* (compare Latin *humus*). I am however not aware that *bhavat* being" also signifies man' as Benfey here asserts. The resemblance of the Gothic base *gu man* man Old High German *go mou lo mon* (nominative *guma gomo lomo*) on which is based our *gam* of *Brautigam* bridegroom (Old High German *brūt gomon* properly *Braut Mann* bride man") to the Latin *ho min he mon* is surprising the relationship however I am now of opinion is confined to the suffix and the German expression in reference to its root belongs to the above mentioned Sanskrit *jana* (compare Graff IV [G Ed p 1111] p 198) with the retention of the old medial (see § 92) and with the loss of the *n* as in the radically and by suffix related *li mon* germ (see § 799 p 1113 G ed Note), and in the Latin *gé minus* (see § 178 at the end). Properly therefore *gu man go mon* signify the born. The circum-

ate" (Graff V 125) as cleaving. Only *pulmon* 'lung' as breathing by transposition from *plumon* (Ionic πλ μω) remains among Latin formations in *mon* with an active signification

stance that we have already the Sanskrit root *jan* contained in Gothic in the forms *kin* (*keina, kaim, kinum*, whence our *Kind*, "child"), *kun* (*kuni*, "sex") and *qum* (*qumns*, "lawful wife," as "she who bears," compare γυνή), need not prevent us from admitting a form which has preserved the original medial. I would recall to mind the fact that both the Gothic *qum*, "to come" (*quma, qum*), and *gagga*, "I go," are derived from the Sanskrit root *gam*, "to go" (see § 755). But to return to the Latin suffix *môn* from it arise the forms *mônia, mōnu*, by the addition of *ia* or *iu*, as, *tōia*, from *tōi* (*victōria*, from *victor*), with this difference, that the primitives in *môn* of derivatives like *quer-i-mônia, al-i-mônia, al-i-mōnum, cer-i-mônia* (root *cer* = Sanskrit *kar, kṛi*, "to make") have disappeared. From adjective and substantive bases also spring, by this double suffix, abstracts like *acri-mônia, ægri-mônia, casti-mônia, miseri-mōnum, tristi-mōnum, testi-mōnum, matri-mōnum*. I consider the *i* of forms like *casti-mônia, ægri-mônia*, to be a weakening of the final vowel of the base-noun (see "*Localismus*," pp 132, 162, and 223), and the *i* of *matri-mōnum* to be an extension of the base, which, in the generality of cases, is added to all bases ending in a consonant. I therefore now regard the *é* in the nominative plural as a contraction of *ai*, and as = the Sanskrit *ay* (from *ai*), of *ay-as ové-s*, for example, therefore, has the same relation to the Sanskrit *avay-as* that *mon-é-s* has to *mân-aya-si*, Prâkrit *māṇ-é-si* (see p. 128 G ed), and thus *pedé-s, amanté-s*, come from the extended bases *pedi, amanti*. Remark that bases in *u* also, in the nominative plural, have simple *s* for their terminative, and that here the lengthening of the *u* represents the Sanskrit and Gothic Guna, e g., *fructu-s*, as in Sanskrit *sûnav-as*, and in Gothic *sunyu-s*, "sons," from *sûnu, sunu* (see § 230.) Compare, also, what has been said before (§ 780) regarding the Old Prussian present participle

798 In Greek there are some bases in *μῦν* which likewise

preserve the long vowel in all cases and resemble the Sanskrit strong cases with *mān* to which with respect to their *i* they bear the same relation that in Sanskrit the plural *kri mān-mas* we buy has to the singular *kri mā mi* (see § 485) Compare *e g* the accusative singular *ρηγμῖν α* and the nominative plural *ρηγμῖν-ες* with analogous Sanskrit forms like *sūshmán-am sushmán as*, while in the genitive singular which belongs to the weak cases the Sanskrit *sushman as* (with short *α*) stands in disadvantageous contrast with the Greek *ρηγμῖν-ος*. The suffix *μιο* feminine *μιν* is connected with the Sanskrit participial suffix *māna* and with reference to the retention of the long vowel stands nearer the latter than the usual *μιο*. To this class belong *καμιος* oven as 'burning glowing from *καίω* *kaw* with the radical vowel shortened *σμιν* strife for which no root occurs in Greek but which Pott (II p 591) rightly traces to the Sanskrit *yudh* to strive (whence *yudhma* strife which would lead us to expect, in Greek *σμος*) *κυκλαμιος* *κυκλαμιν* properly rounded

799 To the Sanskrit masculine substantive bases in *mān* mentioned in § 795 the just mentioned masculine bases correspond in Gothic *ahman* *spirit as thinking (*ahya* I think) *hluman* ear as hearing (Sanskrit root *śru* from *kṛu* to hear Greek *κλυ*) *bloman* a flower as blowing (Old High German *bluot* *floret* *bluont* *florent*) *milman* a cloud (probably like the Sanskrit *megha* originally *māgen** see § 140 p 163 G ed) *sheiman* a lamp as shining lighting [G Ed p 1113] (Sanskrit *lan* to light) * and with passive signification

* I have no scruple in deducing *sheiman* from the root *lin* to shine "to light (*sheina* *skain* *skinum*) with the suppression of the final consonant of the root as *nm* is a combination unsuited to the German hence also in Old High German *līmon*, *chūmon* (nominative *mo*) germ from

mal-man, "sand," as "titurated," also neuter (nominative masculine *malma*, neuter *malmo*, see §§. 140 141.), and *huh-man*, "heap," as "heaped up," from the root, lost as regards the verb, *huh* (euphonic *hauh*, see § 82), to which *hauhs*, "huh" (Grimm, II. p 50), also belongs. The Old High German places over against the Gothic-Sanskrit *man* the form *mon* (nominative *mo*), and in this form corresponds to the Greek $\mu\omicron\nu$. The following are examples *wahs-a-mon*, and *wahsmon*, "vegetables," "fruit," as "growing," or "having grown," *glîz-e-mon*, "lustre," *la-smag-mon*, "taste," with passive signification, *sâ-mon*, "seed," as "sown" (Latin *se-men*)† As in Sanskrit the suffix *man* also forms ab-

[G Ed p 1114] stract substantive from adjective bases, as *prath-i-mân*, "breadth," from *prithû*, "broad" (from *prathu*, compare Greek $\pi\lambda\alpha\tau\acute{\upsilon}$), *liush-i-mân*, "blackness," from *liushná*, "black,"‡ we may also here mention the Old High German *rôta-mon* (also *rôto-mon*, *rôte-mon*),

from the root *kin*, *chin* (*chin-i-t*, "pullulat," *ar-hin-i-t*, *-chin-i-t*, "gignit," "germinat," see Graff, IV 450)=Sanskrit जन् *jan*, "to produce," "to bear" (Latin *gen*, Greek $\gamma\epsilon\nu$), whence *jân-man* neuter, which agrees with *kîmon* in root and suffix, and *jan-i-man* masculine, "birth" *Ger-men*, for *gen-men*, corresponds in Latin With respect to the rejection of the final consonant of the root before the *m* of the suffix, compare the (§ 796 p 1108 G ed) above-mentioned Sanskrit *rô-man*, "hair of the body," as "growing," for *rôh-man*, and Latin forms like *fulmen*, for *fulg-men*, *lû-men*, for *luc-men*, as well as *gê-minus* (see § 478 conclusion), which is probably, in root and suffix, connected with *kî-mon* To *lûmen* corresponds, in root and suffix, the Anglo Saxon *leo-man* (nominative *leoma*), "light," for *leoh-man*, compare Gothic *lauh-mônu*, "lightning" (§ 793)

* The kindred Sanskrit root *vaksh*, "to grow," would, in the middle, form *vâkshamâna*, as participle present

† This has been already explained in the above sense in my Review of Grimm's German Grammar ("Berlin Ann Reg of Lit Criticism," Feb 1827, p 757, "Vocalismus," p 131)

‡ The final vowel of the base-word is rejected before the vowel of conjunction :

redness from the adjective base *rōla* ns n very remarkable analogous form The Latin uses for this object the suffix *mōnix* or feminine *mōnia* (see § 797 p 1111 G ed) extended from *mon*

800 In Lithuanian the suffix spoken of appears in the form *men* nominative *mu* and thus the from a Lithuanian point of view obscure *piemen* nominative *piemu* shepherd s boy corresponds to the Greek ποιμει ποιμην (see § 797) and *akmen* — *mū* stone to the Sanskrit also obscure *asman* — *mā* From a Lithuanian point of view the bases *aug men* *zel men* sprout shoot ns growing (*augu* and *zeliu* I grow) *yoš men* apron string girdle (*yoš mi* I have a girdle on *ap-si yoš mi* I gird myself) *sto-men* stature (*stou yu* I stand compare Sanskrit *sthā* *man* strength from *sthā* to stand) are quite intelligible *Semenys* linseed properly only seed (*seyu* I sow future *šē su*) is a nominative plural as *akmenys* stones from the extended base *akmeni** and leads us to expect a singular *semu*, and therefore corresponds to the Old High German base *sā mon* (§ 799 p 1090) and to the Latin *se men* The Old Slavonic presents a few masculine bases in *men* which in the nominative contrast *my* with the Lithuanian *mu* and Sanskrit *mā* (see § 260 at the end and p 361 G ed) but prefer however the form *meny* [G Ed p 1115] from the prolonged base *meni* (Dobrowsky pp 287 and 289 under *eni eny*) From a Slavonic point of view however only *pla men* (nominative *plamy* or *plameny*) flame as burn

* The suffix *men* forms the entire plural with the exception of the genitive (*al-men ū lapidum* = Sanskrit *asman-am*) from the extended *meni* In some cases of the singular the suffix is extended by the affix *ia* thus in the genitive *akmenio* (like *wilko* § 163) together with the organic *al men s* instrumental *akmeniu* (like *wilku*) together with *al men mi* accusative *akmeni n* locative *akmenyje* according to the analogy of *awije* from the base *awi* a sheep

ing," is etymologically intelligible (πλαυῦνται *planunti-san*, "comburi," παλῖτι *pal-i-ti*, "were," &c., see Miklos. p 62), KAMEN *kamen*, "stone" (nominative *kamī*; or *kameny*) answers to the Lithuanian *akmen*, *akmū*, and Sanskrit *áśman*, *áśmā*.

801. To the Sanskrit neuter bases in *man* (nominative *ma*, see §. 139), mentioned at § 796, correspond the Latin in *min* (*men* in the cases having no termination beyond the base), the Greek in *ματ*, for *μαν* (see §. 497 p 719 G ed.), and the Gothic and Slavonic in *man*, *мен* *men*. The Latin and Greek formations which come under this class have, like their Sanskrit sister forms, either a passive signification, which, indeed, is generally the case, as *praefamen*, *stramen*, *sēmen*, *agmen*, *segmen*, *germen*, "πραγματ, ποιηματ, ῥηματ, ἀκουσματ, γραμματ, γλυμματ, δομοτ, βρωματ, or an active signification, as *flāmen*, *lūmen*, (from *lucmen*), *fulmen* (from *fulgmen*), *tegmen*, *teg-i-men*,† *teg-u-men*, *reg-i-men* ("helm," as "guid-

* *Germen*, from *genmen*, is founded on the frequent interchange of liquids (§ 20)

† The *i* of *teg-i-men*, *reg-i-men*, is identical with the class-vowel of the third conjugation, and leads us, therefore, to the Sanskrit *a* of the first and sixth class, which in Latin has been weakened to *i* or *u* (*veh-i-mus*, *veh-u-nt*, see § 507). This is clear from the long *i* of the fourth conjugation (*mol-i-men*, *fulc-i-men*, as *mol-i-mi*, *fulc-i-mi*), and the *ā* of the first (*certāmen*, *levāmen*, &c.) Forms like *agmen*, *flagmen*, *tegmen*, on the contrary, belong to that period of Sanskrit which combines the suffix *man*, without reference to the conjugation of the verb, almost invariably direct with the root. In the Latin second conjugation we should expect *ē* before the said suffix, and the *mentu* derived from it for it, however, we find, where the suffix is not combined direct with the root, according to the analogy of the third conjugation, *i* or *u*, hence, *sed-i-men*, *doc-u-men*, *doc-u-mentum*, *mon-i-mentum*, *mon-u-mentum*. In general, the Latin *ē* of the second conjugation does not keep its place so firmly as the two other representatives of the Sanskrit tenth class (see p 121 G ed.), hence, also, *doc-u*, *doc-tum*, opposed to *am-ā-vi*, *am ā-tum*, *aud-ī-vi*, *aud-ī-tum*

ing) δσματ ρυματ πιευματ αηματ βρον- [G Ed. p 1116]
 τηματ ειματ, εσθηματ or are abstracts ns *solamen certamen*
letamen lentamen regimen molimen βληματ βοηματ βρυχη
ματ δειματ χαρματ At the end of compounds the original
 ν of the suffix ματ which is corrupted from μαν either re-
 mains in its original form or is entirely suppressed in both
 cases however the α is corrupted to ο (nominative mascu-
 line and feminine μων) probably because the heavy sounds τ
 and α are found less appropriate for the incumbrance of com-
 position than the lighter ν and ο hence πολυπραγμον
απραγμοι αναιμον, and *αιαιμο ακυμον* and *ακυμο αιωιυμο*
συνωνυμο The form *ιωιυμο* is interesting because here we
 find intact the old η of the Sanskrit *nāman* Latin *nōmen* &c
 which in ο νοματ has become τ but elsewhere in the com-
 pounds of this word is suppressed along with its retention
 however we find the base prolonged by ο and the vowel of
 the suffix suppressed (*ιωιυμο* from *ωνουμανο* or *νωιυμοιο*)
 in the latter respect compare the weakest cases of the San-
 skrit *nāman* e g the genitive *nāmn* as dat. *nāmn-ē* and the
 Gothic plural *namn a** *Απαλαμνο* points [G Ed p 1117]
 to a lost substantive *παλαματ* from *παλαμαν* (of which, also
παλαμνῆος is a proof) which apparently has been disused for
παλαμη I would also rather regard *κηδεμνο* head band

* In § 230 p 272 G ed. *namona* is given incorrectly though this form
 would be the regular one (compare *hautōna*) and would correspond well
 to the Sanskrit *namān* : (from *namān a* see § 231) The form *namna*
 on the other hand answers to the Sanskrit weakest cases while the nomi-
 native accusative and vocative plural of Sanskrit neuters always belong
 to the strong (see *Smaller Sanskrit Grammar* § 1.7 Note) It ap-
 pears however that in Gothic it is necessary for the protection of the full
 form *ōna* that it be preceded by a vowel long in itself or by position or
 by more than one syllable hence *augona*, *ausona* *barnilona* *ubilona*
 but not *namona* and probably, also not *iatona* from *iatan* water,
 as the dative is *iatnam* not *iata(n) m* compare Grimm I p 609
 Gabel and Lobe p 67

men "a sign" as "making to know" (*ṣṇa ti* [G Ed p 1118] "to know") and a few words from obscure roots (Dobrowsky p 288). The Gothic furnishes besides *na man* "names" (nominative and accusative *namō* see § 111) which in the other German languages has become masculine only *aldō man* "age" if this word really be as Gabel and Lobe suppose a neuter which cannot be discerned from the but once occurring dative *aldōmin* (Luke i 36). As the neuter abstract of an adjective it would correspond to the above mentioned (§ 799 p 1114 G ed) Sanskrit neuter bases like *krishn i man* "blackness" from *krishna* "black" while the there mentioned Old High German *rota mon* "redness" like *namon* "names" (nominative *namo*) has perhaps first become masculine as it was gradually corrupted. The *ō* of the Gothic *aldō man* I take to be the lengthening of the *u* of the base *alda* (see § 69) "old" which, indeed does not occur but may be inferred from the cognate dialects (see Griffl I 192). If however *aldō-man* is derived not from an adjective but from a verb we must suppose a lost denominative *aldō m* "I grow old" (see § 765) and *aldō mon* would then correspond to Latin formations like *certō men* (§ 801). We can hardly imagine any similarity of formation between the above and the Old High German compounds *alt duom alt tuom* (see Grimm II 151).

803 From the suffix *men min* an *ex* [G Ed p 1110] tended form *mentu* has proceeded in Latin (*argu mentu m mon u mentu m incre-mentu m co-gno mentu m sed i mentu m* &c) in which I do not agree with Pott (*I I* II 591) in recognising the affix of a participial suffix *tu* (*tus ta tum*) but one that is simply phonetic just as in Gothic the base *hun-da* (nominative *hunds*) stands over against the Sanskrit

The causal form of the Sanskrit *pish* Class 7 "to beat down" "to hew in" whence the meaning "to engrave" "to hew in" is easily deducible appears to me the most probable

śun of the weakest cases, and Greek *κυν* (κύων, κυνός), or as, in Latin, the Sanskrit roots *tan*, "to extend," and *han* (from *dhan*), "to smite," "to slay" (Greek θαν), have become extended to *tend*, *fend* (*f*=*dh*, θ, see §. 293 p. 393 G. ed.), and, in Sanskrit itself, *kan* and *chand* (from *land*), "to shine," are originally one. A mute is readily attracted to the side of a nasal, and the former as easily annexes a vowel, and thus, for the Latin extended suffix *mentu*, without reference to gender, we find a parallel in the Old High German *munda* (from *manda*), nonnulative *mund*, but only in the solitary base *hlui-munda*, nominative *hlui-mund* (abbreviated *lu-mund*, our *Leumund*, "renown"), "fame," as "that which is heard," as in Gothic *hlui-man*, "ear," as "hearing" (compare Grimm, II p. 243) The Greek base ἐλμινθ, "worm," as "winding itself," has added to the suffix μιν, mentioned above (§ 798.), only a θ, but in this respect stands as isolated as, in Old High German, the just-mentioned *hlui-munda* The form ἐλμιγγ (ἐλμιγγος) exhibits, instead of the *T*-sound, a guttural, and thus reminds us of the relation of our *yung*, "young" (Gothic *yugg-s*, theme *yugga*=*yunga*), to the Sanskrit *yuan*, in the weakest cases *yūn* (genitive *yūn-as*), and Latin *juvenis*, *junior*. Thus the Old High German suffix *unga* (our *ung*) of abstract substantives, as in *ar-find-unga*, "invention," *warn-unga*, "warning," may be identical with the Sanskrit feminine form of the suffix *ana* (*anā*), so that the first *a* has become weakened to *u*, as in the polysyllabic forms

[G Ed p 1120] of the preterite, as *buntu*, "thou didst bind," compared with the monosyllabic *bant*, "I bound," "he bound" In the same way our root *sang*, "to sing," (Old High German *singu*, *sang*, second person *sungu*), may be compared with the Sanskrit root *śvan* "to sound" (compare Graff, VI p 247).

804. I think I discover the origin of the medio-passive participial suffix *māna*, and of the cognate nominal suffix *man*, in the combination of two demonstrative bases *ma*

and *na* (see §§ 368 369) the vowel therefore being lengthened in *mana* and in the strong cases of *man* and the final vowel in the last mentioned form being suppressed. We must here observe that *na* readily combines with other pronominal bases and then always takes the last place hence अन् *ana* एन् *ēna* in Greek κείνος and in Old Prussian *ta ns* for *ta na-s* he * opposed to the Lithuanian simple *ta s* (*der*) the . If the middle relation be really expressed formally in the suffix *māna mevo* in that case the final element must express the nominative relation or that relation which from time to time belongs to the position of the participle and the unchangeable *mā me* the dative or accusative (*sibi se*) so that therefore न *na* vo denote the person acting and मा *ma* me the person acted upon which however in the middle are one and the same. The suffixes of participles as in general those of adjectives and substantives represent the personal terminations of verbs i.e. those of the third person and I thus consider the *t* of the participle present and future active as identical with the terminations of the third person and like the latter a derivative from the pronominal base *ta* the vowel of which in the participial suffix [G Ed p 1121] is dropped. The *n* of the active participial suffix probably serves only for the phonetic intensification and more emphatic designation of the agent while in the third person plural plurality is symbolically denoted by the same nasalization (see § 236 p 275 G ed) hence the coincidence of *bharant* फेरन्त *ferent* Gothic *bairand* bearing with *bharanti* फेरन्ति *ferunt* *bairand* they bear.

805 We recognise the simple pronominal base *ma* in the Sanskrit suffix म *ma* which in adjectives or substantives denotes the person or thing which completes the action

* Feminine *tanna* with the favorite repetition of the liquid

expressed by the root, or on whom that action is accomplished. Abstracts, also, are formed by this suffix, which, however, is seldom adopted in that state of the language which has descended to us; while the corresponding suffixes of the Lithuanian and Greek (*ma*, *mo*) are of very frequent use. The following are examples in Sanskrit *rukṃá-m*, "gold," as "glittering" (*ruch*, from *ruk*, "to shine"), *yug-má-m*, "pair," as "bound together," *ligmá*, adjective (*-má-s*, *má*, *má-m*), "sharp" ("sharpened"), "hot" (root *ty*, from *tig*, "to sharpen"), substantive neuter (*ligmá-m*) "heat," *bhīmá*, "fearful" ("feared," root *bhi*, "to fear"), *dhūmá-s*, "smoke," as "being moved" (root *dhu*, "to move"), *yudh-má-s* "combatant," "contest," "arrow" (*yudh*, "to fight"), *gharmá-s*, "heat," apparently as "moistening," by sweat (root *gha*, *ghri*, "to sprinkle"), *ishmá-s*, "love" (root *ish*, "to wish"), *idhmá-s*, "wood," as "being burned" (root *idh*, "to burn"). To the latter the Zend *asmas* *aśma* (nominative *mō*) corresponds. Remark the agreement of the above-mentioned Sanskrit words in the accentuation of the suffix with Greek formations like *στολμός-s*, *παλμός-s*, *κορμός-s*, *ὄδυρμός-s*, *κομμός-s*, *τριμμός-s*, *φλογμός-s*, *ἀγμός-s*, *ῥυμός-s*, *χυμός-s*, *κλαυ-θ-μός-s*, *μυκη-θ-μός-s*. In Sanskrit, also, there are

[G Ed p 1122] a few words formed with *ma*, which, like *πότμος-s*, *οἶμος-s*, *ἄνεμος-s*, *ὄλμος-s*, and some others of obscure origin in Greek (Buttmann, II. p 315), have the accent on the radical syllable. To this class belong, for example, *bhāma-s*, "the sun," as "giving light," *śúṣhma-m*, "fire," as "drying." To the masculine nominatives in *ma-s* correspond numerous Lithuanian abstracts in *i-ma-s*, or, with *m* doubled, *i-mma-s*,†

* *oi* is the Guna form of the root *i*, "to go" (compare § 609). Thus, in Sanskrit, *vārtman*, "way," from *var* *t*, *vrit*, "to go."

† With regard to the doubling of the *m*, compare the doubling of *ma* in Old Prussian. I believe I have discovered it to be a general law in Lithuanian, that the doubling of the *m* in the said suffix is only

the *i* of which as in Sanskrit forms like *jan i man*, birth (see § 795) is only a vowel of conjunction. The following are examples *gimm i mma s* birth *ey i mma s* "going" (*ei mi* I go *ey-au* I went), *pa-gadinn i ma s* ruin (*pa gadinu* I mar). In this manner in Lithuanian abstract substantives are formed from adjective bases also in which formation a final *a* of the adjective base is weakened to *u* while bases in *u* have their vowel unchanged. The following are examples *gřidu mma s* varicee from *gřidu s* varicious *grazu mma s* beauty from *grazu s* beautiful *darku-mma s* ugliness from *darku s* ugly *drasu mma s* boldness from *drasu s* bold (compare Greek *θρασύς θαρρύς* Sanskrit *dharsh dhrish* to dare) *rietu mma s* hardness from *rieta s* hard *auks-tu mma s* height from *auks-ta s* high *ilgu* [G Ld p 1123] *mma s* length from *ilgi s* (for *ilgia s* see § 135) long *

806 The Latin has but a few words in *mu s* and those of obscure origin and etymology to offer in comparison with the Indo Lithuanian in *ma s* and Greek in *μο s* as *an i mus* which like the Greek *ἀν i μο s* has originated from the Sanskrit root *an*, to breathe to blow (see § 109 p 126 G ed) *fu mus*=*θυμός* Sanskrit *dhū ma s* smoke (root *dhū* *θυ* see § 293 p 393 G ed) perhaps *pō-mu m* napple as nourishing or being tasted (Sanskrit *pā* to support and to drink compare *pa bulum* *pa sco* *pā u*, *pō-tus* *pō*

only then permitted or rather required when, exclusive of prefixes in combination with the verb the verbal base is monosyllabic. If however it be polysyllabic the *m* is not doubled hence indeed *gimm i mma s* birth, and also *u-gimm i mma s* idem *su-grau i mma s* circumstance (*grauu* 'I occur'), but not *grauden i mma s* warning, but *grauden i mas* (*graudenu* 'I admonish')

* Bases in *ia* nominative *is*, drop their *i* before the *u* of their abstracts which has arisen from *a* hence *diddu mmas* 'greatness, from *diddis*, great

túra), and the adjectives *for-mus* (compare *ferveo*, *fer-mentum*), *fir-mus* (compare *for-tis*, *fero*), *al-mus*. In the German languages, also, the formations of this class are, for the most part, no longer conscious of their origin they occur in Grimm, II. p. 145, where, however, the bases in *ma* and those in *mi*, which have both lost their final vowel in the nominative singular, are not distinguished. I regard the suffix *mi*, which exists also in Sanskrit and in Greek,* as merely a weakened form of *ma*, as in the Greek pronominal base μ (accusative $\mu\acute{\iota}\nu$)=Sanskrit *ma* (see § 368) The Gothic *bag-ms*, "tree" (theme *bag-ma*), probably means originally "the growing" (Sanskrit *barh*, *brih*, "to grow") the adjective base *ar-ma*, nominative *arms*, is perhaps an abbreviation of *ard-ma*, and a shoot from the Sanskrit root *ard*, "to vex," with which I would compare, also, the Sanskrit *ái-ma* (nominative masculine *árma-s*, neuter *árma-m*) "a [G Ed p 1124] malady of the eyes" *bai-mi* (nominative *barms*), "lap," springs evidently from the root *bai* (*barra*, *bar*) to carry." In Old High German *dau-m*, *dou-m* (theme *-ma*, or *-mi*?) "vapor," corresponds to the Sanskrit *dhû-má-s*, "smoke," *trau-m*, theme *trau-ma* (Old Saxon *drô-m*, *drô-ma*), leads us to the Sanskrit root *drâ* "to sleep," *sau-m* (theme *sau-ma*), "seam" to सिक् *siw*, "to sew" (Old High German *siuu*, "suo"); *hel-m*, "helm," as "covering," springs from the root *hal*, "to conceal" (*hulu*, *hal*, *hulumés*)

807 The feminine form of the suffix, viz *má*, does not occur in Sanskrit in substantives, but the Greek in $\mu\eta$, as $\gamma\acute{\nu}\omega\mu\eta$, $\mu\acute{\nu}\eta\mu\eta$, $\sigma\tau\iota\gamma\mu\acute{\eta}$, $\gamma\rho\alpha\mu\mu\acute{\eta}$, corresponds to it, as do the Latin, like *flamma*, from *flagma*, *fáma*, *spûma*, *stíuma*, *glûma*

* *E g दलिसि* *dal-mi-s*, masculine, "Indra's thunderbolt," from *dal*, "to cleave," *भूमिसि* *bhû-mi-s*, "earth," feminine, from *bhû*, "to be," "to become," *δύναμις*, *φῆμις*, *θέμις* (Ion genitive *Θέμι-ος*)

for *glubma* and the Lithuanian in *ma me* * as *uazmà* riding *tūzma* grief (*tuzio s* I grieve) *sluzmà*, service (*sluziu*† I servo) *giesmė* song (*giẽdmu* I sing), *baimė* fear (*biyau* I fear" Sanskrit root *bhi* to fear *bhīma s* fearful" and noun primitive whence the patronymic *bhīmā s* feminine *bhīmī*), *drausmė*† prohibition To this class§ probably be [G Ed p 1120] long also the Lithuanian and Slavonic abstracts in *ba b* *ba*, so that the medial stands in place of the corresponding organic nasal as in *deivini* *ΔΕΙΒΑΤΙ* *deiviny* "nino" (see § 783 p 1079 G ed) and as in the Greek *βροτος βραδύς* = Sanskrit *mṛita s mṛidu s* Thus in Lithuanian we find the forms *tū bė* "grief" *slū-ba* service side by side with *tūzmà* *slu'ma* which have the same meaning *Garbė* honor "fame" (*girriu* I praise) corresponds in its root to the Sanskrit *gar gri* (in the Veda-dialect *ḡ* praise) Abstracts in *be* from adjective bases whose final vowel has been weakened to *y* (=i) are numerous as *silpnỹ be* "weakness"

* *Me* from *mia* (see p 174 Note *) with inorganic *i*

† Thus *drutu ma* strength together with *drutu ma s* from the adjective base *druta* strong

‡ For *draud me* (*draudziu* 'I forbid') according to the analogy of the infinitive *draus ti* in which the change of the *d* before *t* into *s* is regular (see § 457 p 601 G ed) In *ei s mĩ* going (*ei mi* I go) the *s* is euphonic, as in Greek forms like *δε σ μη δ σ μός* A euphonic *s* of this kind sometimes precedes the masculine suffix also but I imagine only after gutturals and then the insertion of the vowel of conjunction; mentioned at § 80 p 1122 G ed, does not take place hence *d-aug s mas* 'joy' (*dzaugio s* I rejoice) *verk s mas* 'weeping' *rek s mas* 'clamor' Hence it appears that in Lithuanian *km* or *gm* is a more favorite combination than *gm km* Compare in this respect the insertions of consonants mentioned in §§ 95 96 from which however is to be excepted the *s* of the Old High German *tarst* 'thou ventarest' *torsta* 'I ventured' as here the *s* belongs rather to the root (Sanskrit *dharsh dhrish*, 'to dare') see *Sanskrit Glossary*, n 1847, p 180

§ Cf p 1178 G ed l 4

from *silbna-s*, "weak," *byaury-be*, "ugliness," from *byaurà-s*, "ugly." The following are examples of Russian abstracts in *ba* *мольба molyba*, "begging" (*молю molyu*, "I beg"); *служба slushba*, "service" (*служу slushu*, "I serve"); *сѣража straschba*, "watching" (*сѣреру stercgu*, "I watch"), *алѣба alba*, "hunger" (*алѣа alcu*, "I am hungry"). Perhaps, as we have seen in Gothic *m* take the place of *b* in the dative plural (see § 215. p. 249 G. ed), so we may assume the converse mutation of *m* to *b*; and, in fact, in the formations in *u-bni* (theme *u-bnya* neuter, *u-bnyô* feminine, see Grimm, II p. 181), occasionally *u-fni*. If we retrace the *b*, which is evidently the more genuine form, to *m*, then, e. g., *vit-u-mni* (*vit-u-bni*) "knowledge," would resemble Latin formations like *al-u-mnus* (see § 178 p. 691 G. ed), and in my opinion the Gothic like the Latin *u* is only a class-vowel, and therefore a weakened form of *a*, or, in Grimm's weak form of the second conjugation, of *ô*, and therefore *vund-u-fni*, feminine, "wound," is for *vund-ô-fni*, from *vund-ô*, "I wound." It deserves notice, that, together with *fraist-u-bni*, feminine, "attempt," there occurs also the form *fraist-ô-bni* (genitive plural *fraist-ô-bnyô*, Luke iv. 13),

[G Ed p 1126] evidently from a weak verb *fraistô* (compare the Old Northern *freista*, "tentare," see Graff, III 830.), which cannot be cited, for the strong verb *fraisa* gives no authority to the *t*, and would make us expect only *frais-u-bni*. In *fast-u-bni*, "fasting," the *u* represents the *a* sound of the diphthong *ai* of the third weak conjugation, where we must observe that the *i* element of this diphthong is dropped also before personal terminations beginning with nasals, thus, as *fast-a-m*, "we fast," *fast-a-nd*, "they fast," for *fast-ai-m*, *fast-ai-nd*, so *fast-u-bni*, from *fast-u-mni* for *fast-ai-mni*.

808 In order to exhaust the presumptive cognates of the Sanskrit participial suffix *māna*, the Latin suffix *malu* must also be here mentioned, the *l* of which, perhaps, like that of *alius*=Sanskrit *anya-s*, "the other," rests on the

favorite interchange of the liquids (see § 20) We divide, therefore *fa-mulus* properly making (for *fac-mulus*) or if as Ag Benry conjectures it belongs to the Sanskrit root *bhā* to honor to serve (compare Gothic *and bah ts* servant) he who serves " *sti mulus* (for *stig mulus*) sting as sticking (compare according to Vossius *στιζω στιγμα* &c) Compare the Irish suffix *mhuil e g*, in *fas a mhuil* growing (*fasaim* I grow) = *taksh a māna* * If however the *a* of *fasa mhuil* is not a class vowel as in *fas a mar* we grow = Sanskrit *taksh ā mas* but to be included in the suffix (to be divided therefore *fas amhuil*), in that case the last portion of the word properly means like and is most probably an abbreviation of the adjective *samhuil*† which occurs uncompounded [G Ed p 117] Words like *feor amhuil* manlike can scarcely be explained otherwise than as compounds of *fear* and *amhuil* The Latin suffix *mulu* might however be also connected with the Sanskrit *mora*, whence *admara* and *ghasmara* voracious from *od ghos*, to eat *srimara* (Wilson) according to some authorities a young deer, from *sar, sri* to go' This suffix however, as *v* and *m* are easily interchanged, is originally one with the more usual *vara* whence *nasuura*, transitory from *nos*, to be ruined *bhāswara* shining from *bhās* to shine' *sthāvara* "standing immovable, from *sthā* to stand

809 Before we pass on to the consideration of those participles which do not like those already discussed belong to any tense of the indicative, and make no distinction between active passive, and middle we must mention one other participle peculiar to Latin viz the participle future passive in *ndu* I have already, in my *Conjuga-*

* It being taken for granted that *taksh* is used in the middle *F* for Sanskrit *v* is in the Irish dialect of the Celtic very usual

† Compare the Sanskrit *sama*, like Latin *similis*

tronal System (p. 115.) considered this, with regard to its form, as a modification of the active present participle, and think I must continue to support this view, though it may be objected that, in this manner, the passive and future signification of the said participle will have no foundation as respects form. But words seldom express in form those relations, to denote which they are destined by the use of language, and grammatical forms often change their original meaning, as, in Persian, the forms in *târ* or *dâr* (*faref-târ*, “deceptor,” *dâ-dâr* “dator,”*), which are based on the Sanskrit nouns of agency in *târ*, Greek in *τηρ*, and Latin in *tor*, *tôr-is*, are used, contrary to their original inten-

[G Ed p 1128] tion, with a passive meaning, also, *gi-rîf-târ*, “captus, captivus, præda,” *ras-târ*, “liberatus,” *kush-târ*, “occisus,” *guf-târ*, “sermo” (see Vuller’s *Inst. L. Pers.* p. 166), while conversely the participles in *tah* or *dah*, which are based on the Sanskrit passive participles in *ta*, have generally an active signification, and retain their original passive meaning almost only when in combination with the auxiliary verb *shudan* (“to be”), hence *burdah*, “qui tulit” = Sanskrit *bhṛtá-s* (from *bharta-s*), “latus,” but *burdah mîshavam*, “feror,” properly “*latus fio.*” The Latin *ferendus* approaches very closely the Persian present participle *ban-dah*, “bearing,” and, like the latter, has weakened the original *tenuis* (of *ferent*) to a medial, and extended the base by the addition of a vowel, both which changes take place also in Prâkṛit and Pâli (see p 319 G. ed.)†. This opinion that

* The choice of *d* or *t* in the suffix depends on the preceding letter
Compare § 91 p 87 G ed

† The Sanskrit also has a few words which, in their origin, are evidently present participles, but have added to the *nt* also an *a*, or have preserved the *a* of the base *ta* (see § 804) They accent the suffix, hence, *bhâsantâ-s*, “sun,” as “lighting,” opposed to *bhâsant* (see §. 785, p 1084 G ed), *rôhantâ-s*, “a certain tree,” as “growing,” opposed to *rôhant*,

the future passive participles have proceeded from the active present participles is confirmed by the circumstance, that the class peculiarities, which do not extend over the present and imperfect, and the forms which spring from the present are preserved in the form in *ndu* e.g. the *n* of *sterno* (see § 196 p 718 G ed) the *t* of *pecto plecto* the reduplication of *gigno* (*gen u*, *gen i tum*) the gerunds also, which are in form identical with the future passive participle point to an original active and present signifi- [G Ed p 1129] cation of the participial form *docendi* "of teaching" *docendo* "by teaching" speak for the signification "teaching" which "*docendus*" must originally have had for such abstract substantives especially those which, like the Latin gerunds express only the exercise of an action spring naturally from active present participles as *abundantia* from *abundant* *providentia* from *provident* and not from passive participles Participles in *tāru* when they form abstracts or rather raise their feminine form to an abstract abandon their future meaning and then pass as present participles or nouns of agency thus *ruptura* tearing as the personification of to tear properly the person who tears *junctura* 'joining' *mistura*, mingling *genitura* producing bringing forth It must be noticed that in Gothic also feminine forms which are used as abstracts spring from adjectives as *mikilei* "greatness" (theme *mikilein*) from the adjective base *mikila* to which it bears the same relation that in Sanskrit *sundari*, "*pulchra*" does to the masculine and neuter base सुन्दर *sundara* (see § 120) so among others also *managē* a multitude from *manag(a)s* many *siukē*

rśhant gadayanā s cloud as making to flow opposed to *gadyant* from *gad* to flow in the causal So in Latin *unguentum* if it be not an extended form of *unguen* (compare § 803) and perhaps *argentum* silver as 'shining' (Sanskrit *ṛaya tā m*) apparently from *rāy* 'to shine' with the vowel shortened

“sickness,” from *siuk(a)-s*, “sick,” (see Grimm, I p. 608). In Greek, too, there are a few adjectives, the feminines of which represent abstracts, in such a manner, however, as that the latter is distinguished from the feminine adjective by throwing back the accent, in agreement with what has been before remarked on similar phenomena in Sanskrit, hence, *θέρμη*, “heat,” *κάκη*, “wickedness,” opposed to *θερμή*, *κακή*, as above, *γλῆς*, “fame,” opposed to *γλῆς*, “famous” (see §. 785. Remark, p. 1091 G. ed.), *γένιμα*, “birth,” *μάριμα*, “death,” opposed to words like *σαρμά*, “wind,” as “blowing” (§. 517) But to return to the Latin participles

[G Ed p 1130] in *ndu*, *secundus*, “the following one,” has correctly retained the original design of the suffix, and the conjecture, therefore, that it is a contraction of *sequibundus* is unnecessary, yet, in my opinion, words in *bundus* in so far belong to this class, as most probably the verb substantive is contained in them in the same way as we have recognised it in the imperfects and futures in *bam*, *bo* (see §§ 526 663). When, however, Voss derives the forms *bundu* from the imperfect, as, *errabundus* from *errabam*, *vagabundus* from *vagabam*, *gemebundus* from *gemebam*, he appears to be in error, as this derivation is not supported by the sense, as *gemebundus* signifies, not “*qui-gemebat*,” but “*gemens*.” I allow, therefore, between *gemebam* and *gemebundus* only a sisterly relation, and take *bundu-s* rather as the participle present of the root *fu*,* with the extension of the suffix *nt* to *ndu*, as in the future passive participle under discussion. In Persian the participle present of the root *bū*, “to be,” would probably be *buvandah* (for *bu-andah*, compare *buvam*, “I may be”), and in Sanskrit from *bhū* really comes *bhāvant*, “being” (base of the strong cases), to which the Latin *bundu*, exclusive of the suffix *u*, has nearly the same rela-

* Regarding *b* for *f*, see §§ 18 526

tion as *bam* (*ama bam*) has to a *bhavam*. The first *u* of *bundu* I take to be not the radical vowel of *fu* but the corruption of an original *a* as in the third person plural (*veh-u nt*=Sanskrit *vah-a-nti*). As a proof that the forms in *bundu s* are in their origin participles may be adduced also the circumstance that they occasionally govern the accusative thus in Livy *vitabundus castra mirabundus unam speciem*. But should these forms originally belong to a tense other than the present we might [G Ed p 1131] recognise in them obsolete future participles and assume that the use of the participle in *turus* has caused them to be less freely employed given room for their being dispensed with and changed their signification. An especial corroboration of this view is to be found in the fact that the majority of forms in *bundus* belong to the first conjugation and that in Old Latinity futures in *bo* occur also in the third and fourth conjugation a form which may originally have belonged to all classes of verbs as has been shewn forms like *legam* and *audiam* are nothing but present tenses of the subjunctive mood and are used as a compensation for the lost futures (see § 692). We should consequently regard *lascibundus* and *sitibundus* as analogous forms of old futures like *scribo dormibo*, only with the vowel shortened as generally before the suffix *bundu s* with the exception of the *d* of the first conjugation only short vowels are found and therefore we have *gemebundus fremebundus* opposed to *dicēbo* and *pudibundus* opposed to *pudēbit*.

810 Let us now betake ourselves to the consideration of those participles which without any formal designation of any temporal or lineal relation have retained their destination in this respect merely by the use of language. These are in Sanskrit the future participle in *tār tri* the perfect passive participle in *ta* or *na* and the future passive participle in *ya tavya* and *aniya*. The first mentioned participle which is at the same time a noun of agency has

been already discussed in §§ 646, 647.; somewhat, however, remains still to be observed on the subject. And first must be noticed the coincidence in accent which exists between the Sanskrit and Greek, since the formations in *नि* *târ*, like the Greek in *τηρ*, regularly accent the suffix, thus, *dâtâr*, nominative *dâtấ* (see § 144.), *dator* and *datûrus*, as in

[G Ed p 1132] Greek *δοτήρ*: *janítâr*, nominative *janitấ*, “genitor,” and “geniturus” = *γενετήρ*. On the other hand, the suffix *τορ*, which in origin and signification is identical with *τηρ*, and the long vowel of whose nominative *τωρ*, is to be regarded only as a compensation for the want of the case-sign, has lost simultaneously its organic length and its accent: it admits, too, of scarce any doubt, that, in Sanskrit, the weight of the suffix *târ* is the cause of its being accented, according to the same principle by which, in the second principal conjugation, the heavy personal terminations assume the accent (see §. 785. Remark, p 1088 G. ed.) The Greek formations in *τη-ς*, which in § 145 have likewise been compared with the Sanskrit in *târ*, have, in part, remained true to the old accentuation, since in forms of more than two syllables a vowel long in itself, or by position, with *σ* generally, and occasionally also with *κ*, *ρ*, *ν*, and *λ*, serves like a dam to the accent which belongs to the suffix, and prevents it from receding farther back, hence, indeed, *δότης* opposed to *δοτήρ*, *dâtấ*, but *μαχητής*, *ποιητής*, *ζηλωτής*, *δικαστής*, *ἀκοντιστής*, *βαστακτής*, *φορμικτής*, *λυμαντής*, *εὐθυντής*, *ποικιλτής*, *καθαρτής*, opposed to forms like *γαμέτης*, *γενέτης*, *πανδακέτης*. The *ε* of forms like *γεν-έ-της*, *γεν-ε-τήρ*, *πανδακ-έ-της*, is most probably a corruption of *ι*, for it corresponds to the *ι*, which often occurs in Latin, and still oftener in Sanskrit, between the root and the suffix, *e. g.* *γεν-ε-τήρ* and *γεν-έ-της* correspond to the Sanskrit *jan-i-târ* and Latin *gen-i-tor*.

811. In the weak cases the Sanskrit suffix *târ* suppresses its vowel, and the accent then falls on the case-terminations

beginning with a vowel while before consonants the *r* becomes *ri* and the accent abides on the suffix hence *datr é* to the giver as in Greek *πατρ os πατρ i* for *πατερ os πατερ i* but *datrí bhyas* to the givers The analogy of the weak cases is followed also by the femi [G Ed. p 1133] nine of the *anua* agent inasmuch as before the feminine suffix *i* which usually receives the accent the vowel of the principal suffix is suppressed hence *dátrí* the female giver The Greek and Latin which possess over the Sanskrit the superiority of retaining the vowel of the masculine suffix (*τηρ top tór*) through all the cases follow notwithstanding the analogy of the Sanskrit in suppressing in the feminine forms *τριδ τρια tri e* (see § 119) the vowel of the principal suffix and the Greek *τριδ* agrees with the Sanskrit *trí* also in the retention of the accent which the form *τρια* (perhaps on account of its increase of syllables) has abandoned thus *ληστριδ αλετριδ αυλητριδ σημαντριδ λαλητριδ ορχηστριδ στεγαστριδ* as in Sanskrit *dátri* The base *γαστρι* deserves especial notice which though also masculine is properly nothing but the feminine of *γαστρ* nominative *γαστηρ** in which I think I recognise the Sanskrit root *ghas* to eat, whence might be expected a noun of agency *ghastár* feminine *ghastri* thus *γαστηρ* properly the male eater and *γαστρι s* (properly the female eater) has indeed experienced a transposition of the accent but has kept clear from the inorganic affix of *n é* in the base The feminine bases in *τιδ* seem to me where they appear as nouns of agency to be abbreviations of *τριδ* they correspond in respects the loss of the *ρ* to their masculines in *τη(ρ) s* but have throughout displaced the accent even where the masculine has retained it in its original site

* In shortening the vowel of the suffix as also in declension *γαστρ* follows the analogy of the words denoting affinity see § 813

thus, not only *ikéti-s* compared with *ikéti-s*, but also *cúṛéti-s* opposed to *cúṛéti-s*.

[G Ed p. 1134] 812 The words denoting affinity in *ṛtár, tri*, are evidently, in their origin, likewise nouns of agency (see "*Vocalismus*," p. 182), for *ṛtár*, weakened from *patár*, and this again from *pátár*, means properly "nourishes," or "ruler," from the root *pá*; and *mátár*, "mother," I regard as "she that brings forth," while I dissent from the Indian Grammarians who derive it from *mán*, "to honor," and prefer deducing it from the root *má*, "to measure," which, with the preposition *nis*, "out of" (*nir-má*), signifies "to make," "to produce," and even without a preposition is capable of this interpretation.* *Duhítár*, "daughter," signifies properly "suckling," from *duh*, "to milk," *náptár*, "grandchild," is in its final element essentially identical with *ṛtár*, "father" this, however, is, perhaps, contrary to my former opinion, (see p. 387, Note †), to be taken here not in the sense of "father," but in its primitive meaning, while we regard the compound not as a possessive but as a determinative, so that *napítár*, in opposition to *ṛtár*, as "ruler," or "family chief," would signify the "not ruler," or "subject," and thus it might mean any member of a family but the father, as also in the Vêda-dialect, *napát*, which has preserved the original

* I now find a strong confirmation of this opinion, which is elsewhere expressed ("*Vocalismus*," p. 182) in the Vêda-dialect in the First Book of the Rig-Vêda (Hymn 61 7), which has been edited in the interim by Fr. Rosen, where the genitive *mátur* occurs as masculine, with the meaning "creator." The Old Persian furnishes the noun of agency *framátár* (*fra* preposition), which is connected in root and suffix with *mátar*, the accusative of which, *framátáram*, occurs repeatedly in the inscriptions with which we are acquainted, and is rendered by Lassen, "*imperatorem*." I have no doubt that the above-mentioned Vêdic *mátur* has an accusative *mátáram* (not *mátūram*), and that, therefore, the theme is properly *mátár*, not *mátūr*, as the *ā* is shortened only in words denoting affinity.

length of the root *pā* signifies in the pas [G Ed p 1130] sages cited by Fr Rosen (on the Rig V I 22 6) son though in form it corresponds to the Latin base *nepōt* as also its feminine *napti* daughter * to the Latin base *nepti* Old High German *nifti* (nominative and accusative *nift*) *Bhrā tar* brother has clearly lost a consonant before the suffix for there is no root *bhrā* If as the Indian Grammarians assume the root is *bhrāj* to shine" we must then observe that the *rāj* which is probably related to it and from which Pott deduces *bhrāj* (for *abhi rāj*) signifies besides to shine' also to rule and therefore the brother" may be so designated as ruler" in the family which according to Indian manners the eldest brother after his father's death really is (see *Vocalismus*" p 182) But *bhrā* in *bhratār* may also have sprung from the root *bhar bhrī* to carry" to support by the transposition and lengthening of the radical vowel just as in the Greek from βαλ βλη σω βεβλη κα βλη-μα &c from πετ=Sanskrit *pat*, to fall" to [C Ed p 1130] fly (πιπτω from πιπετω) πτω and πτη (πτῶσις πτώμα, πτήσις) and in Sanskrit from *man* to think *mnā* to mention'

* This feminine form leads to the conjecture that the masculine *napat* in the weakest cases (see § 130) rejects its *ā* that therefore the genitive would be *napt as* for *napāt as* since feminine bases in *i* generally follow the analogy of the weakest cases as *rajī :* a queen follows that of *rajñē* to the king *rajñ as* of the kin" &c Before terminations beginning with a consonant where *napt* would be impossible I should expect *napāt* thus, *napad blyas* to and from the sons If such forms were confirmed I still could not assent to Benfey's (Glossary to the Sama Veda p 106) conjecture that *ā* in *napāt as* also the *ō* of forms like *dator is* &c is a lengthening that originally belongs only to the strong cases which in the Latin (*nepōt*) has entered into all cases It is more natural to suppose the theme of the Sanskrit strong cases to be the original one, and therefore also in the classical languages for the most part carried through all the cases as is the case in the example before us with the suffix *tor τρη* contrasted with the Sanskrit strong *tar* (shortened in the vocative to *tar*) and with the present participle in *nt*

which is regarded by the Indian Grammarians as a distinct root. If, as now appears to me more probable, this is the derivation of *bhrá-tár*, viz from *bhar*, in that case the "brother" is properly "the supporter," as the stay of the mother, sisters, and younger brothers, after the father's death.* So the husband, also, in relation to the wife, who is termed *bhāryā* ("the female to be supported, to be cherished"), is "the supporter," and as such is called *bhar-tā*, nominative *bhartā*, a word, the creation of which still lies within the clear recollection of the language, and which, therefore, in departure from its supposed cognate *bhrātár*, follows the ordinary declension. The appellation of "sister," in the Sanskrit *swásār*, has still preserved the long vowel in the strong cases, but has, on that account, like the Latin *sorór* from *sostór*, lost a *t*, which has remained in the German and Slavonic languages (Gothic *svistar*, English "sister," Old Slavonic *sestra*), and in the Lithuanian *sesser* (nominative *sessũ*, genitive *sesser-s*, see §. 144. p. 169 G. ed.) has assimilated itself to the preceding *s*. *Swá-s(t)ār* is properly "the wife belonging" (regarding the pronoun *swa*, see § 341.), and is, in its final element, akin to *strī*, "woman," which Pott is undoubtedly right in deducing from the root *su, sū*, "to bear a child" (E I I. p 126), so that, like *fe-mīna* (see § 478 p 691 G. ed.), it originally signifies "the parturient," and is a regular feminine noun of agency up to the loss of the radical vowel

813 The shortening of *ā* to *a*, which most words denoting affinity have experienced in Sanskrit and Zend in

[G Ed p 1137] the strong cases, (with the exception of the nominative singular) appears to have existed so early as the time of the unity of language, as it is scarcely fortuitous that *pitāram*, *pitār-āu* (Vêdic *-rā*), *pitāras*, stand in the same

* So in a passage of the *Sāvitṛī* (p 16 of my translation of "The Deluge") "When the husband (of the mother) is dead, that son is culpable who is not the protector of his mother"

relation to *dālāram dālārāu* (*rā*) *dālāras* as in Greek *πατέρα πατερος πατερης* to *δοτήρα δοτήρος δοτήρης* particularly as the Latin makes a distinction between the declension of words like *pater patris* and such as *dator datoris*

814 In the Veda direct formations in *tār trī* occur also in the sense of the participle present or future governing the accusative, and in this case the accent invariably is thrown back from the suffix to the radical syllable, hence *dātār* giving opposed to *dātār* giver *pātār* drinking opposed to *pātār* drinker (Latin *pōtor*) *hanātār*, smiting *slīyātār* opposed to *hanātār* smiter *slīyātār* casting opposed to *astātār* caster" These participles serve principally to represent the present indicative so that as in the participial future of the classic Sanskrit the verb substantive is either to be supplied or is formally expressed The former is the case if the participle refers to the third person the latter if the first or second person is the subject The forms of this kind which occur in the hymns of the Samā Veda are all in the masculine singular nominative and it is matter for future investigation whether the feminine also occurs in constructions of this kind or whether as in the participial future of the classic Sanskrit the nominative masculine represents the other genders* I annex a few examples from Benfey's edition of the hymns of the Samā Veda *hanta yo vritran sanātā ta (tā uta) vājan dātā maghān* who (Indra) striking (cleaving) is the cloud and distributing is

* That in Zend also, the form in *tar* occurs in the sense of a participle present and governing the accusative is proved by a passage in the beginning of the 21st Farg of the Vendidad (V S p 498) where *𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬀* *bactm* is governed by *𐬵𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬀* *dathrô* to the giving (genitive in the sense of dative as is frequently the case in Sanskrit) *nemas etê dâthro bactm* 'worship to thee the giver of happiness (riches)

food, giving is riches" = "who strikes," &c. (I. 4. 1. 5 4),

[G Ed p 1138] *yá ádrityá śaśamānāya sunwaté dātā jaritrā* (euphonic for . . . *tré*) *ukthyām*, "who is giving that which is commendable to the praise singer, who slays with care, and expresses the juice of the (Sōma)" (II. 1. 1. 14 2.), *twáshṭā nō dāvīyan vāchah parjanyaō brāhmanaspātih*, "Parjanyaś Brahm is creating for us godlike speech"* (I. 4. 1. 1. 7.), *ástā 'si śātravé vadhām*, "thou art hurling death at the foe" (II 9 1. 13 3.). I take *pātā* as a future participle in the following passage. *pātā vritrahá sutām ā ghā gamat*, "*poturus Vritri occisor sōmæ succum adeat*" (II. 8 2. 1 3.).†

As regards the cause of the retrogression of the accent in these expressions, I have no doubt that the aim which the language has in view is most emphatically to express, by the accentuation, the energy of the action, which, in the case

[G Ed p 1139] where the form in *tār* as a participle governs the accusative, appears in its full force, and I am of this opinion, as, as has already been remarked (see §. 785 p 1084 G. ed Remark, at the beginning), the accenting the initial syllable of a word in Sanskrit is the most emphatic.

* *Twáshṭār* is paroxytone also as a noun of agency

† According to Benfey's translation, "let the Vritra-slayer drink the juice," &c, *pātā* would = *pātā syāt*, "*bibens sit*" I doubt, however, that these participles can, without an auxiliary verb, represent the potential or imperative, for the indicative only of the verb substantive is, in Sanskrit, very frequently omitted, as being by the sense itself understood. The enclitic *ghā* (for *gha*), found in the text, in the common dialect *ha*, which, as well as *hā*, occurs in the Vēdas, and attaches itself to pronouns especially (see F Windischmann's *Sankāra*, p. 73, and Benfey's *Glossary to the Sāma Vēda*, p 206), gives me occasion to remark, that I now, in departure from my former explanation (§ 175), regard the Gothic *k*, and our *ch* in *mi-k*, *thu-k*, *si-k*, *mi-ch*, *di-ch*, *si-ch*, as well as the Old High German *h* in *unsi-h*, *h̄mās*, *zwi-h*, *ūmās*, as a particle which has grown up with the base, and as identical with the Sanskrit *ha*, *gha*, and Greek γε (Dor Æol γά), and therefore *dich* as = Sanskrit *twān-ha*, Greek σέγε, as, in a phonetic point of view, *ich*, Gothic *ik* = *aham*, ἐγώ

815 As to the origin of the suffix *lār* it may be regarded as springing from the verbal root *lar* (लृ) * This root properly signifies 'to overstep' 'to transgress' but also 'to accomplish' 'to fulfil,' e.g. *pratyūdān* 'a promise.' And it must be observed that several verbs of motion express also 'to transact' 'to do,' as e.g. *char* signifies (1) "to go" (2) 'to pass through' (3) 'to do' 'to practise,' 'to arrange.' Thus *dātār* 'dator dāns dator' may be taken as 'the accomplisher, the exerciser of giving,' or also if we keep to the primitive signification of the root as 'the man who passes through the action of giving,' as *pārāga* properly 'going to the farther shore' is used in the sense of 'perusing.' The verbal roots therefore in combination with the suffix *lār* are to be taken as abstract substantives which cannot surprise us as some of them appear as such without any annexation of a formative suffix as *bhī* 'fear,' from *bhī* 'to fear'; *hrī* 'shame' from *hrī* 'to be ashamed,' *yudh* 'strife,' from *yudh* 'to strive.' It may be requisite here to observe that in Latin several formative suffixes beginning with *c* can be traced back to the Sanskrit root *kar* कृ (with which *creo* is connected). Thus, for example, *cri* for *ceri*—nominative masculine *cer*, feminine *cri* s—and *eru* e.g. *involver* "flying," properly 'fulfilling the action of flying,' *luluer* *lulicru* s sport 'pleasure' [C I d p 1140]

causū enjoyment, *involucre*, that which envelopes or serves thereto, *lava eru m* that which makes to bathe, bath, *ambula eru m* that which makes to walk out, gives occasion thereto hence promenade, *sepul cru m* that which makes to inter a grave, *lu cru m*, that which causes to pay "gain," *ful cru m* for *fulcru m* 'that which makes to support' "a support." As *r* and *l* are easily

* Compare Benfey, "*Creek Etymology*," II p 107

interchanged, I have no hesitation in referring to this class also the suffix *culu*, and comparing it with the Sanskrit *kara*, "making;" "thus, *ridicu-lu-s*, properly "making to laugh," *pra-culu-m*, "that which makes to atone," *specta-culu-m*, "that which makes to see," "gives to see," *whu-culu-m*, "that which makes to ride," *pó-culu-m*, "that which makes to drink," *mna-culu-m*, "that which makes to wonder," *ba-culu-s*, "that which makes to go" ($\beta\acute{\iota}\beta\eta\mu$, $\epsilon\beta\eta$ -v).

816 From *tár* springs, in Sanskrit, by the affix of an *a*, and with the suppression of its own vowel, as in the weak cases, and before the feminine character *i*, the neuter suffix *tra*, and thence the feminine *trá*. The neuter form is principally used, and, like the rarely-occurring feminine *trá*, forms substantives which express instruments, which are, as it were, the inanimate accomplishees of an action. They Gunize the radical vowel, and, for the most part, in accordance with the Greek analogous forms in $\tau\rho o$, $\theta\rho o$, $\tau\rho a$, $\theta\rho a$,† accent

[G Ed p 1141] the first syllable of the word. The following are examples *né-tra-m*, "an eye," as "conducting," or "instrument of conducting" (root *ní*), *śró-tí-a-m*, "ear" (root *śru*, "to hear"); *gá-tí-a-m*, "limb" (root *gá*, "to go"), *vás-tra-m*, "garment" (root *vas*, "to put on"), *śás-tra-m*, "arrow" (root *śas*, "to slay"), *yók-tra-m*, "band" (root *yuj*, "to bind"), $\epsilon\acute{\chi}\iota$ *dánshíá*, "tooth" (root *danś*, "to

* At the end of compounds *bhás-kara-s*, "making brilliance," "the sun," *bha-yan-kara-s*, "making fear," "formidable"

† It is a question whether the θ of $\theta\rho o$, $\theta\rho a$, is produced by the influence of the ρ , in analogy with the law of sounds in force in Zend (see § 47), or whether independently of the ρ a change or weakening of the tenuis to the aspirate has taken place, as has become the rule in Germanic languages (see § 87). The latter appears to me more probable, as the combination $\tau\rho$ is very usual, but θ for an original τ seems also before vowels, as in the suffix *θev*=Sanskrit *tas*, Latin *tus* (§ 421), and in the personal terminations of the middle and passive which begin with $\sigma\theta$ (see § 474)

bite) *yātrā* feminine provisions (root *yā* to go) So in Greek *ιπτρο* *ι πληκτρο* *ν μακτρο* *ν λεκτρο-ν* (bed' as means of lying') *βακτρο* *ν* (stick as ' means for going') *ζω στρο* *ι ἄροτρο* *ν θελγητρο-ν φίλητρο* *ν ἔλυτρο* *ν θηρατρο* *ι ἄρθρο* *ν βαθρο-ν λειβηθρο* *ν μακτρα* *πι σ τρα* *καλυπτρα* *βαθρα* *κρεμαθρα* The suffix in the class of words under discussion is in Sanskrit seldom accented and still more rarely in Greek the most common Sanskrit word of this kind is *vaktra-m* mouth as speaking" or instrument of speaking so *paktra-m* holy fire properly that which cooks" (root *pach* from *pok*) *dhartra-m* house, as holding" receiving (root *dhar dhri*) *vētra m* a reed as moving itself (root *vi*) In Greek *λουτρο-ν* and *δαιτρο-ν* belong to this class The latter by its passive signification corresponds (the distributed) to the Vedic *dāttram* gift as that which has been given or ' is to be given'* As respects its base syllable however *δαιτρον* (*δαιω*) belongs to the Sanskrit root *dā=dā* to cut off whence *dāttra m* 'a sickle As the suffix *tār* in Sanskrit is occasionally preceded by an *i* as conjunctive vowel so also is *tra* and then either the conjunctive vowel or the base syllable is accented the [G Ed p 1142] former in *khan í tra-m* a spade (*khan* 'to dig') the latter in *iād i tra-m* a musical instrument properly that which causes to speak or utter a sound (root *iad* to speak in the causal) *gār i tra-m* rice properly that which causes to eat nourishes (root *gar gri* deglutire in the causal) As we have above (§ 810 p 1132 G ed) compared the Greek *c* of forms like *γεν ε τηρ* with the Sanskrit Latin vowel of conjunction *i* of the corresponding *jan i tār* *gen i tār* so may also the *e* of *φep c τρο-ν* be taken as the cor-

* Benfey quotes in his Glossary to the Sama Veda p 88 the following passage of the Rig Veda *ási bhāgo así datrusya datā* thou art the Lord thou art the distributor of alms

ruption of *i*, and the said word be contrasted with Sanskrit formations like *lhan-í-tra-m* and *vád-i-ta-m*. It might, however, be the case, that the *c* of *φέρ-ε-τρον* is identical with the class-vowel *ε* of *φέρ-ε-τε*, *φέρ-ε-τον*, &c., then *φέρ-ε-τρον* would correspond to Sanskrit formations like *pát-a-tram*, "wing," as "instrument of flying," *vádh-a-tra-m*, "weapon," as "slaying," *kṛínt-a-tra-m*, "plough," as "cleaver" (root *kṛit* from *kart*, in the special tenses *kṛínt*, compare *κείρω*): for which, indeed, the Grammarians assume a suffix *atra*, the *a* of which, however, appears to me identical with the inserted vowel of the first and sixth class, thus *pát-a-tra-m*, like *pát-a-ti*, "he flies," *kṛínt-a-tra-m*, like *kṛínt-a-ti*, "he cleaves."* Thus in Greek the *η* of forms like *φίλη-τρον* and *κόρη-θρον* evidently belongs to the verbal base, and is identical with that of *φίλη-σω*, *κορή-σω*. The same is the case with the *á* and *é* of the corresponding class of words in Latin, *ará-tru-m*, *fulgê-tru-m*, *fulgê-tra*, *veí-é-ti-u-m*, where it must be observed, that, according to § 109^{a.6}, the *á* of the first as well as the *é* of the second conjugation are identical in their origin with the *η* of the above-mentioned Greek forms.

[G Ed p 1143] As, however, the *é* of the second conjugation is less permanent than the *á* of the first and the *í* of the fourth (see § 801. p 1115 G. ed. Note †), we cannot be surprised to find, not *mulgê-tra*, *mulyê-ti-u-m*, but *mulc-tra*, *mulc-tru-m*, not *monê-tru-m*, but *mon-s-ti-u-m*. The *s* of *monstrum* corresponds to the euphonic *s* mentioned in § 95. A similar one is also to be found in *lu-s-trum* and *flu-s-trum*. *Vi-ti-u-m*, "glass," as it were, "instrument of seeing," or "making to see," has lost the *á* of the root. We should have expected *vis-trum* (see §. 101.) according to the analogy of *ras-trum*, *ros-trum*, *claus-trum*, *cas-trum*. In the third con-

* The Indian Grammarians include the *i* of the above-mentioned words in *i-tra* in the suffix

jugation the class syllable of which has from the time of the unity of language as a rule not extended itself beyond the present with its derivatives and the imperfect the suffix is joined for the most part direct to the root hence, *e g ru trum spec trum* In the fourth conjugation we should expect *i trum* contrasted with *ā trum* in the first and *ē trum* in the second but when we find *haus trum* from *haurio* this is in conformity to the other anomalies of that verb

817 The Zend has, according to § 47 changed the *t* of the suffix *tra* into *th* but leaves it unaltered after sibilants which in general do not admit of *th* after them hence *e g* 𐬨𐬀𐬎𐬌𐬎𐬭𐬀 *yao-hdāthra* means of purification (V S p 263) nominative and accusative *thre m* (see § 30) *doulhrē-m* eye (as seeing) is connected in its root and suffix with the Greek *θεατροι* although the meaning of the latter has taken a different direction since it signifies the place which affords the spectacle The corresponding Sanskrit root is most probably *dhyāi* with which Pott (*E I I* p 231) has been the first to compare the Greek *θεαμαί* although *dhyāi* signifies not to see but to think where it is to be observed that 𐬔𐬀 *budh* also to know has in Zend received the meaning of to see ns 𐬨𐬀𐬭𐬀 [G Ed p 1144] *vid* to know has in Latin while the Greek root *id* (*εἶδω oīda*) unites the two meanings Remark also with Burnouf (*Yaçna* ' p 32) the New Persian root *dī* to see (infinitive *dī dan*)* and the contraction which the Sanskrit root *dhyāi* has experienced in the substantive *dhi* (nominative *dhi s*) understanding insight The following are examples in which the suffix spoken of has preserved its original tenuis under the protection of a preceding sibilant *vastrem* robe feminine *vastra* (see § 137, Sanskrit *vastra m*

* The present *binam* belongs probably to a different root and in fact to the Sanskrit *vid*

see §. 721. p. 985. G. ed. Note †), and *𐬨𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬌* *vāstra* (as theme), "the willow," as "growing" (connected in its root with the Old High German base *uabhs-a-mōn*, "shrub," "fruit," see §. 799. p. 1113 G. ed.), whence the often occurring *vāstravat*, "willowy," as also *vāstiya* (nominative -yō), "farmer." The Zend uses the formations in *thra*, *tra*, also in the sense of abstract substantives, which, according to what has been said (§ 809. p. 1129 G. ed.) regarding the radically connected Latin formations in *tūra*, cannot surprise us. The following are examples *𐬔𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬌* *dar-ē-thrēm*, "possession," "reception," "retention" (Sanskrit root *dhar*, *dhru*, "to keep"), *𐬔𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬌* *mar-ē-thrēm*, "mention" (Sanskrit root *smar*, *smru*, "to remember"), *𐬔𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬌* *khā-* [G. Ed. p. 1145] *thrēm*, "splendor," | *𐬔𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬌* *khā-ē-trēm*,

* I doubt not that this expression comes from the Sanskrit root *chakṣh*, "to grow," which, in Zend, in the Guna-less special tenses of the fourth class, is contracted to *uec*. With respect to the suppression of the guttural in the above form, compare the relation of the Sanskrit *chash-tē*, "he says," to the root *chakṣh*, and the Zend *chashman*, "eye" (as "saying," "announcing"), to the same root, and to the cognate Sanskrit *chāhshus*.

† At the end of compounds, *e g.* *pōw-u-khāttha*, "having much lustre" (see Burnouf, "Yaçna," p. 421). I consider *khāttha* to be an abbreviation of *khartha* (*kharēthra*, according to § 44), and derive it from the root *khar*, "to shine," whence, also, *𐬔𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬌* *khāiñō*, "lustre." The root *sur* (from *swa*, see § 36) corresponds in Sanskrit. The loss of the final consonant of the root appears to be compensated by lengthening the vowel, as in the Sanskrit *jātā*, "born," from *jan*, *khātū*, "dug," from *khan*. Observe, also, the relation of the Zend *𐬔𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬌* *azām*, "I produce," to the Sans *jājanmi*. Burnouf gives another derivation of *khāttha* "lustre" (l. c. p. 419) dividing it into *kha*, "suus," and *āttha*, according to which its literal meaning would be "*suum ignem habens*," and therefore *āttha* would be connected with the word *ātar*, "fire," which is used in its uncompounded form, and the *a* of which is suppressed in the weakest cases, hence, *e g.* *āthr-at*, "igne," *ātth-anm*, "*ignum*." Burnouf touches also on the possibility of the prefix *𐬔𐬀* *su*, *hu*, "fair," being contained in *khāttha*, in which case its proper signification would be "*pulchrum ignem habens*"

taste' The latter Burnouf (*Yaçna* " p 220) derives undoubtedly with justness from the Sanskrit root *svād* the transition of *d* into *s* is here quite regular (see § 102 conclusion), and *khastrem* therefore resembles both in the euphonic treatment of the radical *d* and in the suffix the (§ 816 p 1143 G ed) above mentioned Latin formations, as *claus trum*

818 As regards the formation of abstract substantives through the suffix under discussion the German languages admit of comparison with the Zend in several interesting forms The Gothic furnishes us with the neuter base *maur thra* (nominative accusative *maurthr* see § 153) murder properly the killing the obscure root of which leads us to the Sanskrit *mar mri* to die' causal *māra yamī* I slay * Besides the above J Grimm (II p 123) deduces from *blōstreis* a neuter *blostr* oblation [G Ed p 1140] (theme *blōstra*) which I should be glad to admit did it anywhere occur Nevertheless I think its existence must be assumed and I derive from it the existing masculine *blos treis* the base of which *blōstrya* (see § 135) has the same relation to its presupposed primitive base *blōstra* that the previously mentioned Zend *vāstryō* (theme *vāstrya*) countryman has to its primitive base *vastra* pasture † The root of the Gothic base *blōs tra* is *blot* to sacrifice' to

A derivation however in which *khathra* would etymologically also signify what the sense requires and according to which it would be radically identical with a word (*khariṇo*) literally meaning lustre appears to me the most natural

* The *u* of the Gothic form is a weakening of *a* to which according to § 82 an euphonic *a* is prefixed As most of the German languages have lost the *r* of the Gothic *maurthr* and consequently the agreement between them in suffix with the primitive suffix *tra thra* is no longer recognisable we should remark with care the English murder

† It is a rule in Sanskrit that verbal bases terminating with a vowel reject their final vowel before vowels or *y* in an annexed derivative suffix

woisrup," whence, according to § 102., *blōs-tra*, in analogy with the Zend *khāś-tra*, "taste," from *khād-tra*, so *gils-tra*, "tax," nominative and accusative *gilstr*, from *gild-tra*, *gild-tr*, from the weakened form of the root *gald*, with the preposition *us* and *fra*, "to repay."* The *a* of the Old High German *gels-tar*, *kels-tar*, *ghels-tar* (Graff, IV. 194), I take to be an auxiliary vowel inserted to remedy the harshness of an accumulation of consonants at the end of a word, and which, on the annexation of the case-terminations in these and similar words, is for the most part again dropped, hence genitive plural *ghels-tro*, so from *bluos-tar*, *blos-tar*, "oblation," dative *blos-tre*, from *hlah-tar*, "laughing," "laughter," dative *hlah-tre* † We have, therefore, in the common German expression *Ge-lach-ter*, as also in the English "laugh-ter," analogous forms to the Zend abstract neuter bases in *thra*, *tra*, as also to the San-

[G Ed p 1147] skit formations in *tra*, Greek in *τρο*, and Latin in *tru*. Thus in English also "slaugh-ter," which in its radical part, graphically at least, is more perfectly retained than the cognate verb "slay." Probably, also, "thunder" and "wea-ther" are to be included in the class of words which are formed in Sanskrit by the suffix *tra*, though the *t*-sound of the suffix is lost in the appellation of "thunder" in the older dialects (Old High German *donar* masculine, Old Saxon *thunar*, Anglo-Saxon *thunor*), on the other hand, in Latin we have *ton-i-trus*, *ton-i-tru*, where the *u* of the fourth declension is matter of surprise, as the Sanskrit *a*

* With respect to the interchange of *t*, *th*, and *d* (*blōs tra*, *gils tra*, compared with *maur-thra*), in suffixes originally commencing with *t*, I refer the reader to § 91

† Whether the gender be masculine or neuter is not to be determined from the cases which occur (accusative *hlah-tar*, dative *hlah-tre* and *hlah-tere*), as, however, the perfectly analogous *blōstar* shews itself, by the accusative plural *blōstar*, to be neuter, I agree with Graff (IV 1112) in considering *hlah-tar* also as neuter, in accordance with the analogous Gothic and Zend forms.

would lead us to expect only the inorganic *u* of the second declension (see § 116) The corresponding Sanskrit root is *stan* to thunder whence *stan ayi tnu s* the thunder * *Heather* belongs to the Sanskrit root *ad* to blow whence also the Lithuanian *uc-tra* storm" To return to the Gothic *fō dr* sheath (theme *fo-dra*) and *huli s tr* veil (theme *huli s tro*) belong to the class of words here discussed The latter proceeds from the [G Ed p 1148] verbal base *hul-ya* its *i* therefore is the contraction of the syllable *ya* as in the preterite *hul i da* I regard the *s* as an euphonic affix as in the Latin *lu s tru m flu s trum* (see § 815 conclusion) *cap i s trum* The following nominal-derivatives are analogous *ai s tr* sheep cote ns place of the sheep" from the lost primitive base *ai* (=Sanskrit *ai* Lithuanian *ai*), and *navi s tr* grave ns place of the dead from *naus* theme *nai a* with the weakening of the *a* to *i* ns in the genitive *navi s* (see § 191) Observe that the Greek and Latin languages very frequently transfer the suffixes of verbal derivatives to nominal derivatives *Fō dr*

* *Ay* is the character of the tenth class and *tnu* the suffix which forms adjectives with the signification of the participle pre ent and masculine appellatives as, *harsha jñtus* rejoicing and as a substantive masculine son ns the causer of rejoicing" (so *nandana* 'son from *nand* 'to rejoice) The *i* is evidently merely a vowel of conjunction as in the future *stan-ay i shydti* it will thunder there also exists as well as *i tnu* a more simple suffix *tnu* as in *hatnu s* masculine, sickness, and a weapon ns slaying from *han* to slay' The *t* of *tnu* and *itnu* may be regarded in the same light as the euphonic *t* mentioned above (§ 797 p 1076 Note†) so that therefore only *nu* would be left as the true suffix as appears in *bhanu s* 'son ns giving light The circumstance that the Latin *ton i tru s ton i tru* stands in the class of words under discussion in a very isolated position owing to its *u* of the fourth declension may lead us to compare it with respect to its suffix also with the Sanskrit *stanayitnu s* by assuming an exchange of the liquids so that *tru* would stand for *tnu* just as in the Latin *pul mo* (for *plu m*) and *l* stands over against the Greek nasal of πνε μων (compare § 20)

"sheath," theme *fô-dra*, in its obscure root corresponds to the Sanskrit *pâ*, "to receive," and in its entire form to *pâtra-m*, "vessel," as "keeping" With respect to the Gothic *d*, for the *th*, which was to be expected, compare *fa-drem*, "parents," with the Sanskrit *pr-tárâu* (for *pa-*), which is also radically connected with *fô-dr* (see § 812) The Old High German *fô-tar*, *fuo-tar*, "fodder" (for *fô-ti*, Anglo-Saxon *fô-dr*, *fô-dlier*, *fo-ddar*, *fo-ddur*) is identical in root and suffix with the appellation of "sheath," which "supports," but only in a different manner from that in which "fodder" does. To this class of words may be added, with more or less certainty, a few other Old High German neuters which end, in the nominative and accusative, in *tar* or *dar*. viz. *flu-dar*, "float," from the root *flu* (=Sanskrit *plu*), which has generally assumed the affix of a *z* (see 109^b. 1. p 124 G. ed.), *flô-dar*, "*fluor*," from the same root, *ruo-dar*, "rudder," apparently as "making to flow or navigate," in root and suffix akin to the Latin *ru-trum*, and Greek *ῥέ-θρον* (*ῥέω* from *σπε(F)ω*, Sanskrit *srávâmi*, from the root *sru*, "to flow," causal *srāvay*), and radically, perhaps, [G. Ed p 1149] also with *re-mus*.† Perhaps, too, we ought to class here *wundar*, *wuntar*, "wonder," and *wuldar*, "glory,"‡ as derivatives from roots now unknown.

819 To the Sanskrit feminine suffix *trâ*, as in *dânshtrâ*, "tooth" (see §. 816. p 1141 G ed), the Gothic *thlô*, in *nêthlô* (nominative and accusative *nêthla*), "needle," as "instrument of sewing," corresponds, as in the Greek *ἀκέστρα*, but with *l* for *r*, which, according to § 20., cannot surprise us, particularly as the Greek suffixes *τλο*, *θλο*, *τλη*, *θλη* (see Pott, II. p 555), are

~ The Sanskrit form for *flu-dar*, *flô-dar*, would be *plô-ti a-m* (*ô = au*)

† Graff, II. p 493, presupposes a root *rad*, but the Anglo-Saxon *iovan*, *reovan*, *ievan*, "*remigare*," mentioned by him, proves the contrary, and answers to the Sanskrit causal base *srāvay*

‡ Gothic *vulthus*, probably with *thu*, =Sanskrit *tu*, as suffix

likewise evidently to be referred to the Sanskrit *tra trā*, as in ὄχρελον χρυθλον θυσθλον ἐχρελη γενεθλη ὄχρελον in a Sanskrit form would be perhaps *iaḥ i tra m* or *iaḥ a tra m*. With regard to γενεθλη as an abstract substantive I must remark that in Sanskrit also the feminine suffix *trā* is occasionally used to form abstract substantives, thus the *yātrā* mentioned above (§ 816 p 1141 G ed) means also gait. In Old High German the word for needle exhibits in the nominative and accusative in different writers *nā dila nā dila nā dela* and *nā dal* the Anglo Saxon form is *næ dl*. We have further to mention in Gothic *hleithra* (theme *thro*) a tent which has retained the old *r* though its root is obscured it belongs in my opinion to the Sanskrit *sri* from *kri* to go (compare *śśman* house from *vis* to enter) whence a *śśaya śś* asylum house and in Gothic also *hliya* masculine (theme *yan*) a teat. To this root belongs also among other words the Old High German *hleī* [G Ed p 1100] *tara* (for *hleitra*)* (which on account of its suffix also belongs to this class) Anglo Saxon *hlædre hlæ der*, German *Lei ter* ladder as instrument of mounting.

820 Let us now consider somewhat more closely the perfect passive participle which we have already had occasion to mention more than once † Its suffix is in Sanskrit and Zend usually *ta* (masculine and neuter) feminine *tā* and is I have no doubt identical with the demonstrative base *ta* (see § 343) There is no ground therefore in the word itself for a passive signification except perhaps in the accent for while according to § 785 Remark p 1086 G ed the ac

* Graff (IV p 1115) quotes for the nominative the forms *leitra hlestar leitera leiter* genitive *hleitra*. It admits of no doubt that the forms in *r* have lost a final *a* and that they cannot be classed with *muotar tohtar suestar* of which the proper termination is *r*.

† See §§ 513 588

tive forms require the most powerful accentuation, i.e. the accent on the first syllable, in the passive participle under discussion the suffix receives the accent hence we have *paktás*,^{*} “coctus,” accusative *paktám*, standing similarly opposed to *páchan*, “coquens,” *páchantam*, “coquentem,” as above (§ 785. Remark, p. 1097 G. ed.) *śúchyátē* “purificatus,” is opposed to *śúchyatē*, “purificat.” Greek verbals in *τός*, which, as scarce needs to be noticed, are identical with the perfect participles passive of the cognate languages, have retained the old accentuation, and thus we have *ποτός*, *ποτή*, *ποτόν*,[†] standing in the same relation to *πότος*, “the drinking” (compare § 785 Remark, p. 1091 G. ed.), that, in Sanskrit, *píyátē*, “bibitus,” has to *píyātē* (Class 4, middle), “bibit” The paroxytone or proparoxytone accent of abstracts in *το* appears to be preserved principally where, together with the abstract,

[G Ed p 1151] the passive verbal is actually in use, and where, consequently, there is the more ground for bringing the abstract meaning prominently forward by the accent, whilst otherwise the abstract follows in its accentuation the prevailing example of verbals with passive signification; hence, indeed, *πότος*, *ἄροτος*, *ἄμητος*, *τρύγητος*, *ἐμctος*, *ἄλctος*, opposed to *ποτός*, *ἀροτός*, *ἀμητός*, *τρυγητός*, *ἐμctός*, *ἄλctός* (*ἄλητον*), but not *κόπετος*, *κώκυτος*, *ἀλόγητος*, but *κοπctός*, *κωκυτός*, *ἀλοητός*, as these abstracts have no oxytone passive verbals to match them. There are, however, some isolated abstracts, or words which express the time of an action, which have the accent thrown back, as *βίοτος*, *δείπνη-σ-τος*,

821 The participial suffix *π ta* is either joined direct to the root or by a vowel of conjunction *ι*. To the first kind of formation belong *jñā-tá-s*, “known” = Greek *γνω-τός*,

* *पक्* *pach* forms its participle anomalously, and makes *पक्ता* *pakwa*
See Wilson's Gr p 294

† Compare the Sanskrit *pítás*, *pítá*, *pítám*, from the root *pá*, “to drink,” which, in the passive, has the *á* weakened to *i* There is also a middle root *pí* of the fourth class

Latin (g)no tu s i gnô tu s dat id s 'given * Zend dâ tô (themē dâta) Latin da tu s Greek δο-το s sru lā s heard
 Greek κλυ το-ς Latin clu tu s bhû ta-s been being
 Greek φυ-το s bhri tu s (from bhartas see § 1) borne
 Zend bēretô (theme ta) Greek (φερ το s) ἄ φερ το s Latin
 fer tus bearing fruitful stri ta s extended (from
 startas) Zend fra stareô (fra preposition) Greek στρα το s
 (transposed from στραρ το s) Latin strâ tu s pak ta s cooked
 Greek πεπ το s (root πεπ from πεκ Sanskrit pach from pak
 Latin coc from poc) Latin coc tu s uk ta s spoken (irre-
 gular for uaktas) Zend uctô (hûcto well spoken from hu
 ucto) yuk ta s bound Greek ζυκ το s Latin junc-tu s
 bhrish ta s roasted' (from bhrashtas and thus from bhrak
 tas) Greek φρυκ το s Latin fric tus bad [G Ed p 1152]
 dha s bound (euphonic for badh ta s root bandh) Zend
 bas to † lab-dha s obtained (euphonic for labhtas) Greek
 ληπ το s jā ta s horn" (root jan) Zend zâ to Greek γε-
 το-ς in the compound τηλυγετος † mata s, 'thought (root
 man) Zend malo (compare μεν ε το s) drish ta s shewn
 (euphonic for dis tas from dik tas see § 21) Greek (δεικτος)
 αναποδεικτος χειροδεικτος &c Latindic tus dash ta sh bitten
 (euphonic for das tas from dak tas) Greek (δηκ το s) ἄδηκτος
 καρδιοδηκτος drish ta s seen (from darshitas and thus from

* From dadutas with irregular retention of the reduplication of the special tenses

† See § 102 p 10. G ed and compare Greek analogous forms as κεστ s πιστ s With regard to the Latin form of this participle in roots ending with a T sound see § 101

‡ It is a rule in Sanskrit that before formative suffixes beginning with t which require no Guna augment the n and m of the root are rejected Jan to produce, to bear and khar to engrave lengthen their vowel in doing this From han to smite to slay comes hatas with which we may compare the Greek φάτος, as ΦΕΝΩ (φ s π φ o) like θ ησκαω most probably belongs to the Sanskrit root han from dhan (ni-dhana death)

dark-tás), Greek (ᾠερκτός), ἐπίᾠερκτος; *ush-tá-s*, "burnt," Latin *us-tu-s*. The following are examples with the conjunctive vowel *i* *prat-i-tá-s*, "extensus" (root *pr* and *ῥιath*, whence *prithú-s*, "broad," from *prathú-s*, Greek πλατύς, Lithuanian *pla-tù-s*), *añch-i-tá-s*, "erectus," *pat-i-tá-s*, "qui cecidit" So in Latin *dom-i-tus*, *mon-i-tus*, *mol-i-tus*, *gen-i-tus*. In Greek the *c* of forms like *μεν-c-τός*, *σκελ-c-τός*, *ἐπ-c-τός*, corresponds, where we again leave it undecided whether this *c* be a corruption of an *i* or an *a* †

[G Ed p 1153] 822. The Latin forms in *idus*, springing from neuter verbs, and for the most part of the second conjugation, as *pall-i-dus*, *serv-i-dus*, *frig-i-dus*, *torr-i-dus*, *tim-i-dus*, *tep-i-dus*, *splend-i-dus*, *nil-i-dus*, *luc-i-dus*, *fulg-i-dus*, *viv-i-dus*, *sap-i-dus*, *flu-i-dus*, correspond to the participles in *tá* in Sanskrit, which spring from neuter verbs, and have an active signification, and especially to those which have a present meaning; as, *twar-i-tás*, "hastening," *sthitás*, "standing," *suplás*, "sleeping" (also "having slept"), *śaktás*, "being able," ‡ *yat-tas*, "striving," *bhī-tás*, "fearing," *hrī-tas*, "being

* Regarding the active signification of this participle in neuter verbs see § 513. conclusion, so, in Greek, *στατός*, "standing," = Sanskrit *sthitás* (weakened from *sthitás*), which likewise has a present signification on the other hand *pr-a-sthitás* means both "proficiscens" and "profectus"

† Compare § 816, p 1142 G ed, and Curtius "De Nominum Græcorum formatione," pp 38, 60 Indian Grammarians assume a suffix (*unádi*) *atá*, the *a* of which, however, is most probably only a class-vowel, with which the Greek *ε* might be compared, thus, *ἐπ-ε-τός* (compare *ἐπ-ε-τε*) like *pach-a-tás*, "fire," as "cooking" The abstracts *θáv-a-τος*, "death," and *κάμ-a-τος*, "fatigue," have preserved the conjunctive vowel in its original form, and thus correspond to the Sanskrit *mar-a-tá-s*, "death," where, however, we must observe that the Sanskrit root *mar*, *mri*, "to die," in its verbal conjugation, does not belong to the first or sixth class any more than the Greek roots *θav* and *καμ*

‡ The form with the conjunctive vowel (*śak-i-tás*) has a passive signification, so *yat-i-tás*, "obtained by efforts, sought for," compared with *yat-tás*, "striving" In Latin, *vice versá*, *rap-i-dus*, active, opposed to *rap-tus*, passive.

ascribed and to the Greek *στατος* standing, *μεικτος* remaining *ερεπτος* creeping. The opinion therefore elsewhere stated appears probable that the *d* in the Latin forms just mentioned is only the weakening of an original tenuis* just as in *quadraginta quadruplus quadruplex* for *quatraginta* &c. An active and present meaning though in a transitive verb and with the retention of the old tenuis occurs in the participle spoken of in [G Ed p 1154] *fertus* bearing" fruitful which corresponds in form with the Sanskrit *bhritas* from *bhartas* borne Zend *bercto* and Greek *-φεπτος* (see § 818)

823 The Sanskrit verbs of the tenth class and the causals identical with them in form, have all of them the conjunctive vowel *i* hence *pid i tas*, pre sed" pained *iés i tu s* made to enter. The circumstance, however that the said verbs extend their character *ay* (in the special tenses *aya*) to the general tenses also and a great part of the formation of words gives room for the conjecture that the *i* of forms like *pid i tas iés i tas* is not the ordinary vowel of conjunction but a contraction of *ay* or that such forms in *i tu s* have been preceded by older ones in *ay i tas* according to the analogy of the infinitives as *pid ayi tum*. As then Latin supines like *am-ā tum* and *aud i tum* are related to *pid ayi tum* just such is the relation of *am-ā tus* and *aud i tus* to the presupposed *pid ayi tas*. Although the Latin second conjugation also belongs to this class and for example *moneo* corresponds to the Sanskrit causal *mān-ayā-mi* and Prakrit *mān ē mi* (see p 121 G ed) I would nevertheless prefer to identify *mon i tus* with *mān i tas* in such a way

passive. Observe also the active *cup i-dus* together with the passive *cup i tus*. These however are only arbitrary usages which rest on no general principle.

* *Influence of Pronouns in the Formation of Words*, pp 21 22. Iott is of a different opinion. *E I II* p 567

that I could thence infer the existence of similar forms in the time of the unity of language, while I would prefer assuming a casual coincidence in the similar abbreviation of a common element. In Greek the η or ω of forms like $\phi\iota\lambda\text{-}\eta\text{-}\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$, $\tau\iota\mu\text{-}\eta\text{-}\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$ (from $\tau\iota\mu\text{-}\tilde{\alpha}\text{-}\tau\omicron\varsigma$), $\chi\epsilon\iota\rho\text{-}\omega\text{-}\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$, corresponds to the character of the Sanskrit tenth class, and therefore to the Latin \acute{a} and \acute{i} of *am-á-tus*, *aúd-í-tus*. In Gothic, where, as generally throughout the German languages, this participle remains regular only in the so-called weak conjugation, the old tenuis, instead of, in accordance with § 87., becoming an aspirate, has sunk down to a medial, in suchwise, however, as that before the *s* of the masculine nominative,

[G Ed p 1155] and in the accusative, which has lost the final vowel of the base and the case termination, a *th* for *d* enters (compare § 91.) According to the difference of the conjugational class, an *i* (from *ya*), *o*, or *ai*, *i* e. the three different forms of the Sanskrit character of the tenth class (*ay*, see § 109^a. 6) precedes, hence the bases *tam-i-da*,* “domitus,” *friy-ó-da*,† “amatus,” *ga-yuk-ai-da*, “subjugatus,” nominative masculine *tamiths*, *friyóthhs*, *gayukarths*, accusative *tamith*, &c., genitive *tamidi-s*, &c. (see §. 191) The direct annexation of the participial suffix occurs in Gothic only in certain irregular verbs, and in such a manner that, according to the measure of the preceding consonant, either the original tenuis is preserved, or has become *d* (see §§ 626. 91) Thus the base *bauhta*,‡ “purchased” (*bugya*,

* Compare Sanskrit *dam-i-tás* (from *dam-ayí tás*?) from *damáyām i* causal of the root *dam*, “to tame,” but of the same meaning as the primitive and the Latin *dom-i-tus*

† It may be regarded as the denominative of the Sanskrit *príya*, “dear,” “beloved,” and it is also, radically and in its formation, akin to the Greek $\phi\iota\lambda\text{-}\eta\text{-}\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$ (from $\phi\iota\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\omega$, denominative of $\phi\acute{\iota}\lambda\omicron\varsigma$, transposed from $\phi\lambda\iota\omicron\varsigma$), the η of which has sprung, like the Gothic *ó*, from *á*

‡ Euphonic for *bukhta* (see §. 82), and thus for *bukta*, from the root *bug*

"I purchased") corresponds to Sanscrit forms like *bhukta* * "eaten" (root *bhij* from *bhug*) Greek like *πορω* and Latin like *juncta* *mun-di* believed answers to the Sanscrit *mun-ta* thought believed for *mun-ta* as the feminine substantive base *ga mun-di* (nominative *n-di*) does to the Sanscrit base *mu(n)-ta* meaning,

601 In Lithuanian the participial suffix spoken of is retained quite unaltered in form and indeed in all verbs so far as they have a passive. In the nominative masculine *ta s* corresponds to the Sanscrit *ta s*, e.g. *sak-ta s* followed = Sanscrit *sik-ta s* (root *sac-* from *sak* 1) [61] p. 1163] follow compare Latin *sequor*) *seg-ta s* fastened = Sanscrit *sak-ta s* for *sig-ta s* (root *ṣṇj* *sañj* from *sang* "to fasten") *deg-ta s* burnt = Sanscrit *dig-dha s* † In the nominative feminine *sik-ta seg-ta deg-ta* correspond to the Sanscrit *sik-ti deg-ti* † only with the *a* shortened as in Gothic Latin and Zend forms like *baulta* (gentive *bauhtu s*) *juncta* *αρωαs* *hasta* (see § 17) to the Latin *juncta* corresponds literally the Lithuanian *junkti* from *junju* I yoke (the oxen) *lept-as* *lepta* (from *leptu* I brake see § 501) corresponds to the Sanscrit *pal-ti s* *ti* Greek *πε-το-ς* *τι* Latin *c-tu s* *ta* Forms like *icē-tu s* conducted (root *icē-*) correspond in a euphonic respect to Zend like *ba-s-ta* bound (root *bandh-* *vis-tu* dead (root *irith*) and Greek like *πε-το-ς* *κε-το-ς* (see § 100) To the Gothic participles of the weak conjugation correspond the participles of those Lithuanian conjugations which we have above

In the former part of this work the accent is not given to Sanscrit words as the subject of Sanscrit accent has not then been investigated. In 1847 Böhtlingk published a treatise on Sanscrit accentuation (as the Author of this work tells us in the Preface to his Fifth Part) which opened up a new field of inquiry. The work over that is then in *Pūrti* is the accent and does not denote now Lithuanian.

† D euphonic for *t* see § 101. In Irish *d ghu* I turn corresponds to the Sanscrit *d h mi* and *tyje* turned to the passive participle *t-j-ta s* Lithuanian *d-gtas*

(§ 506, p. 704) compared with the Sanscrit tenth class, thus, *myl-i-tas*, "beloved," *pen-ē-tas*, "nourished," *lail-γ-tas*, "held"

825. The Slavonic languages have, if the opinion expressed in § 628 be well founded, transferred to the active voice the passive participle here spoken of with the retention, however, of the meaning of past time and have weakened the original *t* to *l*, probably by changing it in an intervening stage to *d*. In the former point they correspond to the New Persian, where the participle in question has, at least generally, an active signification in the latter point they agree with the Georgian, where ჯამული *jam-u-li* signifies "eaten" (Sanskrit *jam*, "to eat"), and თბობილი *thbob-i-li* "warmed" (Sanskrit *tap*, "to burn")

[G Ed p 1157] The suffix *lo* (n. m. *лъ l'*, neut. *lo*, f. *la*) is joined, in Old Slavonic, either directly to the root or to the class-syllable, the latter in the verbs which correspond to the Sanscrit 10th class and the German weak conjugation, hence, *e g* *былъ byl'*, *была byla*, *было bylo*, "been" = Sanscrit *bhūtás*, *tá*, *tám* (pers *būdeh*), *пилъ pi-l'*, *пила pi-la*, *пило pi-lo*, "having drunk" = Sanscrit *pī-tás*, *tá*, *tám*, "drunk," *пелъ nesl'*, *пела nesla*, *пело nes-lo*, "having boined," *будилъ būd-i-l'*, *будила būd-i-la*, *будило būd-i-lo*, "having waked" = Sanscrit *bódh-i-tás*, *tá*, *tám*, "waked" Should, however, these Slavonic participles not be connected with the Sanscrit participles in *ta*, it appears to me almost impossible to compare them with forms in the cognate languages, at least I do not believe that the suffix *la*, which occurs in Sanscrit only in a few words, *e g* in *chap-a-lá-s*, "trembling," or the suffix *ra*, the use of which is in like manner but rare, *e g* that of *dīp-rá-s*, "shining," can have served as the source from which the Slavonic participial suffix *lo* is derived

* With regard to the change of the old *t*-sound into *l*, compare also the Gipsy *mu-lo*, "dead," from *mudo*, Prākṛit *mudo* (nom masc.)

896 The Slavonic languages however are not deficient in forms also which have preserved the old *t* and the passive signification of the participle under discussion although in all the Slavonic dialects this participle is generally formed by the suffix *no* (from *na*) = Sanscrit *na* of which hereafter. In the Old Slavonic we find an example in *to* (nom masc *ti t* fem *ta* neut *to to*) in *otati olat t* *adentus* (prep *ot* from) which in root and formation corresponds to the Sanscrit *yata s* (for *yan ta s* from *yam ta s*) and Latin *entus**. In Slovenian [G Ed p 1168] or Carniolan the passive participles in *t* are very numerous *eg ster t* extended (compare Zend *stare'a* Sanscrit *strita*) *der t* flyed *bi t* struck *slu t* famed (Sanskrit *sru ta s* heard *vi sru ta s* famed Greek κλυ-τος)†. In Russian the following are examples *numbu pi tyi* drunk (Sanskrit *pi ta s*) *pro-vnuu in pro-li tyi* spilt *po-ti tyi* enveloped *po bi tyi* smitten slain *kolotyï* stuck *manyubny tanulyi* drawn ‡. The opinion however that the suffix *t la lo* is based on the Sanscrit *ta s ta ta m* is not refuted by these forms as it is by no means uncommon in the language to find together with the new and corrupted form the original also existing with regard to which I will here only refer to the division of the suffix here treated of into *tu* and *du* (see § 872) which in my opinion made its first appearance in Latin

Remark — A Schleicher who in his work ‘*The Languages of Europe*’ p 261 *passim* opposes the opinion that the Slavonic participle referred to is in its origin identical with the Sanscrit in *ta* finds it inexplicable that from the to-be presupposed forms like *nest* the favourite combination of consonants *st* should be changed into the much rarer *sl*

* Kopitar Vocab p 78, and Miklosich *Doctrine of Forms* p 47

† See Metelko p 105 *passim*

See Reiff ‘*Grammaire Russe*’ p 188. The termination *yi* or rather the simple *i* (from *yo*) fem *ya*, is the affix mentioned above (§ 284) of the definite declension

I, too, believe, that had the to-be-presupposed form *nest* stood alone, it would, owing to the firmness of the combination *st*, and its being such a favourite, never have become *nesl*. And though I assume *ç* as a middle point between *t* and *l*, and allow the language, in its corruption of the suffix referred to, to have proceeded from *to* to *do*, and thence to have arrived at *lo*, I nevertheless do not think that in every individual verb this process has been *de novo* and independently carried on, nor do I imagine that there ever existed in Slavonic a participle *nesd'*, *nesda*, *nesdo*; but I assume that the *t* of the suffix under discussion has, in the different

[G Ed p 1159] conjugations, and the majority of verbs, gradually been corrupted to *l*. Were, however, *lo*, in the majority of Slavonic verbs, once substituted for the suffix *to*, it might, as it appears to me, be transferred by the force of analogy to those verbs also with whose final letters a *t* agrees better than *l*. Only in the case that the combination *sl* had been unendurable in Slavonic would the roots in *s* and those in *d*, which, according to a general euphonic law in Slavonic (see § 457), change this letter before *s* into *t* have necessarily retained the elder form of the suffix. I must here recal attention to the fact, that the Bengālī also possesses a preterite, which appears to be of participial origin, and has *l* for its most essentially distinguishing feature, e g *kōrilām*, "I made" (*kōr-i-lā-m*), 2d pers *kōrila*. It is highly probable that, as Max Muller ("Report of the British Association for Advancement of Science for 1847," p 243) assumes, the *l* of these forms has arisen from *t*, through the intervention of a middle point *d*, and that the entire form owes its origin to the Sanscrit perfect passive participle in *ta*, so that, therefore, *kōrilām* would equal the Persian *kardam*, from which it is materially distinguished only by the further weakening of the *d* to *l*, and the insertion of the vowel of conjunction *i*, which, also in Sanscrit, is very common in the participle referred to. In the 2d pers sing *kōrila* answers to the Persian *kardi*. With regard to the use in Bengālī of the Sanscrit passive perfect participle without alteration of form and signification, it is to be remarked that this is avowedly borrowed at a later period (see Haughton, § 241), and so, in general, in the Bengālī lingual Thesaurus one has to distinguish between the words which have been, as it were, moulded and remodelled in the lap of the daughter language, and those which have been adopted newly from the Sanscrit. Should we, however, be desirous of seeking out in order to explain Bengālī preterites like *kōrilām*, a class of words in Sanscrit to which they would in external form correspond better than to the passive past participles in *ta*, we must then betake ourselves to the suffix *ila* (properly *la*, with *i* as conjunctive vowel), which has left behind only a very small family of words, to which belong among

others *an* } *la s* wind as blowing *path* } *li s* traveller (from *path* "to go") One does not however see how this rare suffix with a present signification has arrived at the destination of forming a preterite in Bengali from every root. Another modern Indian dialect which furnishes a corroboration to the Slavonic languages with [G Ed p 1160] respect to the participle under discussion is the Marathi*. Here a perfect passive participle in *l* (m) & (f) *l* (n) † springs from every verbal root

* It is very much to be regretted that the learned Professor has been guided in his remarks on the Marathi language by Carey's Grammar which was published half a century ago and at a Presidency where the Marathi language is not so well known as at Bombay. Hence he gives a past participle in *ल* to transitive verbs the fact being that this participle is never separated from the vowel which marks the gender and must be e.g. पाहिला *pahilā* पाहिली *pahilī* पाहिले *pahile* never पाहिल *pāhil*. The sentence म्या बायकोस पाहिल *myā bāyā s pahil* I saw the woman is altogether incorrect. It should be मी ती बायका पाहिली *mī tī bāyakā pahilī* or मी त्या बायकोला पाहिले *mī tya bāyakolā pāhilen*. With reference to the termination *स s* and *ला lā* in this case (be it the dative or as I regard it, the accusative) Dr Stephenson rightly lays down the following rule. When motion to a place is intended then *स s* is preferred but when the dative is the object of a verb then *ला la* is more common, as तो गावास गेला *tō ga-wās gēlā* he is gone to the village त्याने त्या बायकोला मारिले *tyāne tya bāyakolā marilen* he beat that woman. I am at a loss to guess where the learned Professor found authority for stating that the Sanscrit short *ā* is pronounced in Marathi like *o* for so far from this being the case I do not believe that that sound of *o* exists in any of the modern languages of India except Bengali save perhaps before *r* — [Note by the Translator]

† The Sanscrit short *a* is pronounced in Marathi and Bengali like *o* so that the neuters of the participle under discussion in that language correspond exactly to those of the Slavonic as *neslo* (see § 255 a). The long *a* in the masculine of the Marathi adjectives is probably based on the Sanscrit nominatives in *as* so that for the suppression of the *s* compensation is made by lengthening the preceding vowel. On the other hand the pronominal nominatives *मी to* he and *जि* which (*j* from *y* see § 19) are based on the corruption which the termination *as* has everywhere experienced in Zend *Iah* and Prakrit (see § 56 b). Adjectives as such are not declined in Marathi.

e g *pāhulā*, "having seen,"* *keḷā*, "having made," the latter being, as it seems, from *hailā* for *harilā*. Compare the Bengālī *kārilām*, "I made," and the Piākṛit *kada* from *karda*, "made." The active construction of other languages is, in the Marāṭhī, changed into the passive by a periphrasis in the past tenses, which are wanting in that language, as in most of the Slavonic dialects, and thus, *e g* *myā* † *kēḷa*, *myā kēḷi*, *myā kēḷō*, which Carey translates by "I did," is literally nothing else than "*a me factus, facta, factum*," although Carey, in this and analogous tenses, appears in reality to recognise an active form of expression for he remarks (p 67), "It must be observed that the gender of the verb, in the imperfect, perfect, and pluperfect tenses, varies, to agree with that of the object." That which, however, is here called the object, is, in fact, the grammatical subject, and the participle is governed by this, not only in gender, but also in number. At p 129 it is remarked, "It must be observed, that when the verb is used actively, viz when the object is expressed in the accusative, the form of the neuter singular only is used. When the object is in the nominative case, the verb is passive, and varies with the gender of the subject." Ex. *myā* वायकोस् पाहिल *myān bāyōkōs pāhulō*, "I saw the woman," *myā* वायको पाहिली *myān bāyōkō pāhulī*, "the woman was seen by me." I am convinced, however, that the first construe-

[G Ed p 1161] tion is quite as much passive as the second, for were it active, the pronoun must have stood in the nominative, and have sounded therefore *mīn*, and not *myān*, ‡ as in the second. The difference between the two constructions is only this, that in the first the neuter passive participle stands impersonally, or contains the subject in itself, and governs an accusative, while in the second the participle is the predicate of the subject, expressed by *bāyōkō*, "woman." Could the first construction be imitated in Latin it would be literally rendered by "*a me feminam visum (est)*." In Greek, constructions such as *τοὺς φίλους σοι θεραπευτέον* correspond to this. In neuter verbs, *i e* the substantive verb in combination with various ideas, the Marāṭhī participle in *lā*, *li*, *lō*, like its Sanscrit prototype in *ta-s*, *tā*, *ta-m*, has an active signification, and has therefore also the pronominal or substantive subject placed before it in the nominative; and thus we have, *e g* *mīn gēlō-n*, "I went," properly "I am having gone," since the substantive verb, in spirit at least, is contained therein (see § 628 Rem 1), fem *mīn gēḷi-n*, 2d pers masc *tūn gēḷā-s*,

* *H* for Sanscrit *śh* of the defective root *pash* (*pashyāmi*, "I see")

† *Myā* corresponds to the Sanscrit instrumental *mayā*

‡ Evidently only an inorganic extension of the above-mentioned *myā*

sem *gll* ३ 3d pers. masc to *g* *lā*, sem *t gll* without a personal termination. So in the verbal substantive, *m n jhālā-n* 'I was' ('I am having been') sem *jhalē n* 21 pers. *jhalā s*, *jāl s* 3d pers *tō jālā*, *t jhāl*. The Marathi therefore, here appears almost in the dress of the Polish which in like manner in the 3d person gives the bare participle but in the 1st and appends to it the personal terminations masc. by *em* *lyt-es* *lyt* fem *byta m* *byta s* *byta* neut *lyto-m* *byto-s* *byto* (see § 69 Rem 1). Irrespective of the passive participles newly borrowed from the Sanskrit, and which for the most part remain entirely unchanged as *dolto* given *yukto* bound *groto* swallowed *somapto* ended there is in Marathi perhaps only one solitary participle of this kind which has preserved the old *t* viz *hōti* sem *hōti* (or *loti*) neut *lōto* having been = Sanskrit *lī tā s* *ī ā m* (see Prakrit *h m* 'I am') whence *hōto-n* 'I was', as above, from another root and with a corrupted suffix *ह्यति j'alo-n*. According to this analogy one should expect *hō n* from *hō*. The participle which is found in the so-called 2d aorist present *e g* the form *m n kort-n* 'I do' ('I am doing' see Sanskrit *kartusmi* 'facturus sum') sem *m n karti* 'I derive from the Sanskrit participle future or noun of agent in *t r tri* [C Fd p. 116.] nom. masc. *tā* which frequently occurs in the Veda dialect in the sense of the participle present (see § 814). The 2d pers. masc. *kort-s* 'thou doest' answers to the Sanskrit *kart-s* 'facturus es' or 'factor e' but the substantive verb is not contained in the Marathi form but only the character of the 2d person and this participle is treated in Marathi as if it had been formed in Sanskrit by the suffix *ta* (not by *tr* or *tri*). In the substantive verb both the Sanskrit *bhūta s* 'been' and *bhaviṣi ti* 'futurus' are represented in Marathi by *lōta*. The said language however is not wanting in forms in which the form corresponding to the Sanskrit noun of agency or participle future appends its suffix by a conjunctive vowel *e g* इच्छितो *ichchitō* 'wishing' (Carey p 80) sem *icchititē*. As regards the *ō* of the masculine form *icchit*, it corresponds to the *ō* before men

* That the participle which appears in the 2d aorist present is not, perhaps formally based on the Sanskrit passive participle in *ta* is evinced in the case before us by the circumstance that not only does *kartō-n* answer better to *karta* than to *krītā s* but also that beside the genuine Marathi *lētā* 'made' mentioned above there exists in Marathi a second borrowed form *krotō* (see Carey p 36 *īśorō/rotō* 'God formed') which, like the Prakrit *kada* (for *lārda* or *krnda*) is based on the original form *larta* of which *krita* is a contraction (see § 1)

tioned (p 1125, Note †) pronominal nominatives, as *tô*, "he," *jô*, "which," while *tâ* in *hôtâ*, "being," answers to the ordinary adjective-nominatives in *â*. Carey, in the different verbs and auxiliary verbs which his grammar exhibits, gives, in the 3d pers mase of the 2d aorist present under discussion, pretty indifferently either *ta*, or *tô*, or *tên*, only in *holô* he gives only *tâ*, but elsewhere either *tôn* or *tô*. The nasal of the former is most probably only an morigamic affix, which the Marāthī occasionally adds also to some other forms which end in a vowel; as, *e g* in the instrumental *मयाँ myān*, "by me" (with *myā*), mentioned above (p 1126), and the analogous *tuān*, "by thee" (Carey, p 127), together with the *tiô* from the base *tva* (see § 158) corresponding to the Zend Grammar. We must similarly regard, I doubt not, the Anusvara of the repeated participle in *तं तान*, as *hōtôn*, *hōtān*, "doing, continuing to do," since this participle

[G Ed p 1163] is only by its repetition distinguished in formation from that by which the 2d aorist present is periphrastically denoted. The case is different with the termination *ton* of the 1st person, in which the never-failing *n* is the expression of person=Sanskrit *mi*, and the preceding portion of the word is the masculine nominative. The feminine allows in the 1st person the suppression of the *n*, hence *hōr-tē*, "I make," opposed to *sōh-tē-n*, "I can" (Carey, p 79), with *ē* for *i*, which appears in the 2d person *hōiti-s*, while the masculine form retains its *ô* (*hōitô-s*).

827 By *ta* with the conjunctive vowel *i* in Sanscrit are formed, from substantives, also adjectives, which can be taken as the passive participles of to-be-presupposed denominative verbs, as, *e g phal'-i-tā-s*, "furnished with fruit," from *phalā*, "fruit," whence might spring a denominative *phal'-ayā-mi*, "supplied with fruits," which would form a passive participle *phal'-i-tā-s*. Corresponding forms in Latin are such as, *barbā-tus*, *alā-tus*, *fimbriā-tus*, *cordā-tus*, *aui-tus*, *turrī-tus*, *versū-tus*, *veiū-tus*, *astū-tus*, *unctū-tus*, *jus-tus*, *nefas-tus*, *sceles-tus*, *robustus*, (*robust*, *robustus* from *robust*, *robustus*), *honestus* (*honestus* from *-stus*), and in Greek, forms like *κροκω-τός*, *ὀμφαλω-τός*, *αὐλω-τός*, *φολιδω-τός*, *ἀνανδρω-τός*. Let attention be directed to the inclination towards a long

* Carey, p 92, *tô hôtâ*, "he is". (literally, "he being")

vowel before the suffix *ained* as well in Latin as in Greek. In like manner as the originally short *u* of the 1th declension and the *i* of the 3d is lengthened so also is the morganic *u* of the 2d in *nasu tus* and *o* is in themes terminating in a consonant the *i* which extends the base (see p 104) e.g. in *mati tus patri tus* which according to form at least belong here so also in Greek is the *o* which extends the base hence e.g. *φολιδω-τος*. The word *αμαξι-τος* stands alone properly

furnished with a wagon which by the suppression of the final vowel of the base and the assuming a vowel of conjunction *i* corresponds admirably to Sanscrit formations like *mudr i tas* sealed from *mudrā* a seal [C Ld p 1161]. Here belong also the Latin formations in *-tu* in *arborē tum quercē tum finē tum pomē tum* which as Pott too assumes (I tyin Inqui p 316) is as it were presuppose denominatives of the 2d conjugation in which we might well expect participles like *mone tus* (see pp 1107 1108).

828 In Lithuanian and Slavonic also adjectives spring from substantive bases which in form and signification correspond to the passive perfect participles here treated of. Examples in Russian are *porannii rog a tyi* horned (Lithuanian *ragutai*) from *pori rog* theme *rogo* horn *volosnyii iolo a tyi* like hair from *rolo* theme *oloso* hair *gorbunii gorb a tyi* humpbacked from *gorb* theme *gorbs* hunch *imenii ime ni tyi* named from *ima* theme *imen* name *tresnii tres noi i tyi* embroidered covered with embroidery from *tresna* embroidery *domoi i tyi* domestic from *dom* house (see p 318)*. The words which belong

* The above examples according to Dol rowsky (p 59) apply in part also for the Old Slavonic compare therefore the formations beginning with a consonant from the *d* nominatives treated of in § 766 e.g. the infinitives in *a ti i ti* or *a ti* (§ 768) with which the insertions *a i (or i)* (I i ed on the Sanscrit *a ja*) of the nominal participles above are identical

here have, part of them, inserted an *s* before the *t* of the participial character, according to the manner of the Greek verbals like ἀκκ-σ-τός, ἀκου-σ-τός, and of the Lithuanian abstracts in *stė*, opposed to the Sanscrit in *tā*, and Latin in *ta*, *tāt*, *tū*, of which hereafter. Thus, *e g* in Russian, каменныи́й *kamen-i-styĩ*, "stony" (Lith. *akmen-ũ-tas*), терни́й *tern'-i-styĩ*, "thorny" (*tern'*, theme *terno*, "thorn" = Sanscrit *trina* from *tanna*, "grass"), борода́чныи́й *borod'-a-styĩ*, "bearded, provided with a beard," (*boroda*, "beard," compare Sanscrit *vanth*,

[G Ed p 1165] *vanth*, "to grow," Lith *barzda*, "beard," *barzd'-ũ-tas*, "bearded") In Lithuanian an *o* usually pre-

cedes the suffix *ta* of this class of words (occasionally instead of it *ũ* = *uo*), after the analogy of the denominatives treated of in §§ 766, 767, in the formations beginning with a consonant (§. 767), and in fact so that here also the final vowel of the base noun is dropped before the vowel which forms the denominative verbal base; thus, *e g* *migl'-o-tas*, "misty," "attended with mist," from *migla*, "mist," *plauk'-o-tas*, "hairy," from *plauka-s*, "hair," *plunks'-o-tas*, "feathery," from *plunksna*, "feather," *dumbl'-o-tas*, "slimy," from *dumbla-s*, "slime" In forms like *akmen-ũ-tas*, "stony," *rag'-ũ-tas*, "horned," from the bases *akmen*, *raga*, *ũ* is only a substitute for the simple *o*, as, *e g* in *važ'-ũ-yu*, "I drive," opposed to *dumoyu*, "I think" (see p 701) The verbs, however, in *ũyu* for *oyu*, do not retain their *ũ* in the formations beginning with a consonant, but here exhibit simply *o*, whence *važ'-o-tas*, "driven," not *važ'-ũ-tas*. In forms which admit of comparison in Sanscrit a long *ā* fills the place of the Lithuanian *ũ*, as, *e g* in *dādāmi*, "I give," *āsmā*, "stone" (nom of *āśman*) for the Lithuanian *dūmi*, *akmū* * The simple *o* also is often, in Lithuanian, the

* I see, therefore, no reason to compare the forms in *ũta-s*, *ota-s*, with the possessives in Sanscrit like *dhana-iant*, *-vat*, "rich," from *dhana*, "riches," which are formed by the suffix *iant* (in the weak cases *vat*) Cf Pott, II p 546

etymological representative of a Sanscrit long *ā* e.g. in the feminine plural nominatives like *asuras naves* (sing *asura*) contrasted with the Sanscrit *āśrās* and Gothic forms like *gibos* (see § 227) We may therefore identify both the *u* of forms like *akmen u las* and the preponderating *o* of such as *migl o-las plauk-o-las*, with the *ā* of Latin forms like *cord-ā tus* as with the *o* too of Mielcke's 11th conjugation e.g. that of *yes-k-o-me* we seek *yes k o-* [C Ed p 1166] *las* sought is essentially identical with the Latin *ā* of *am ā mus am-ā tus** The forms in *e las* in Lithuanian stand alone, as *dulkē las* covered with dust dirty from *dulkės* dust (nom pl from the base *dulkē*) † as here the *ē* of the base takes the place of the derivative *o* which is found e.g. in *raukl-ō las* wrinkled from *raukl-ē* wrinkle

829 The feminine of the suffix *πτα* viz *tā* forms in Sanscrit also abstract substantives from adjectives and substantives They accent the final syllable of the primitive base e.g. *śukla tā* whiteness from *śukla* white *samā tā* levelness from *samā* level *prithu tā* breadth from *prithu* broad *śadhyā tā* abstract from *śādhyā* occidendus *stri tā* womanhood from *stri* woman In Greek correspond the abstract substantive bases in *τητ* and in general in the matter of accentuation also with the addition of a *τ* (see § 832) which shews

* Above also (§ 506) Mielcke's 4th conjugation ought to have been identified with the Sanscrit 10th class it is distinguished from the 3d l.v. thus that it retains the *o* in places where the latter excludes *y* (=f) in the class syllable, hence, e.g. *yer-k o las* sought, *yes k o su* I will seek compared with *lak y tas* 'held' *lak y su* I will hold "

† Feminines in *e* like *giesme* song (Mielcke p 33) presuppose an older *ia* hence in the genitive plural *or gu* (=ic l.v. *giesmy*), as *rank manuum* from *rankā* (see § 167 Note 3) Remark also that to the masculine adjective nominatives in *is* (from *ia s*) belong feminines in *e* e.g. the feminine of *dida s* 'great,' is *dide* or *didi* (Mielcke, p 47)

itself also in the corresponding Latin suffixes *tāt* and *tūt*,²⁴ hence, *e g* ἰσό-τητ, κακό-τητ, ὀγριό-τητ, πλοτύ-τητ (= *prithútā*),

[G Ed p 1167] *facili-tāt*, *habili-tāt*, *levi-tāt*, *celēi-tāt*, *civi-tāt*, *puri-tāt*, *veri-tāt*, *antie-tāt*, *ebrie-tāt*, *sovie-tāt*, *liber-tāt*, (for *liber-tāt*, as *liber* for *liber-u-*), *puber-tāt*, *maγis-tāt*, (from *maγis*), *ictus-tāt*, *venus-tāt*, *eges-tāt*, *potes-tāt*, | *felu-i-tāt*, *virgin-i-tāt*, *hered-i-tāt*, *juven-tūt*, *senec-tūt*, *vir-tūt*, *seivi-tūt* In *senec-ta*, *juven-ta*, *vindic-ta*, (from *vindic-*, *vindic-*) the suffix appears without the addition of a *t* The German, too, as has already been shewn, *l c.*, is not wanting in analogous formations Their theme ends in Gothic in *thō*, which corresponds as exactly as possible to the Sanscrit *tā* (see §§. 69 87), and in the noun is abbreviated to *tha* (§. 137), hence, *e g* *dupr-tha*, "depth," *hauða-tha*, "height," *gaumi-tha*, "mounfulness," *nuugi-tha*, "novelty," in the *i* of which I recognise the weakening of the *a* of the adjective primitive-bases *dupa*, *hauða*, *gauma*, *nuuga*, in agreement with the principle observed in Latin, which, in like manner, weakens the inorganic *u* of the 2d declension, which corresponds to the Gothic 1st, to *i* (see § 6), or to *e* in case that another *i* precedes it (*puri-tāt* for *puru-tāt*, *vane-tāt* for *vaniu-tāt*) The organic *u* also of Grimm's 3d adjective-declension is weakened before the suffix under discussion to *i*,[†] hence,

* See "Influence of the pronouns on the formation of words," pp 22, 23, where, however, from the classical tongues only *tāt*, *τητ*, are contrasted with the Sanscrit *tā* It, however, admits of no doubt that *tūt* also belongs here, as the weakening of the *ā* to *ū* can no more surprise us, than that of *a* to *u* (cf *tūrus*=Sanskrit *tār*, p 647)

† *Eges-tāt* and *potes-tāt* come from the participial-bases *egent*, *potent*, and, indeed, so that the nasal is thrown out, and the *t* changed to *s* before the *t* following (see § 102) On the other hand, *volut-tāt* for *volen-tāt* (from *volent*) has preserved the *n* in preference before the final consonants This is also Pott's view (E I, II p 562), who here refers to the Greek χαρίεσ ταιος, from χαρίεντ, he, however, admits the possibility of *potes-tāt* being derived from *potis*

‡ Regarding the weight of the *u*, see s 584, and "Vocalismus," p 227

aggu tha "narrowness from *aggu* narrow *manu tha* readiness from *manu* ready *afgrundi tha* abyss from the base *grundu* ground belongs at least as regards formation here. The bases in *ya* with *ı* [G Ed p 1168] consonant preceding reject their *a* before the suffix *tho* and vocalise the *y* to *ı* hence *nuıyı tha* novelty from the base *nuıya* but not *fıırnıyı tha* but *fıırnı tha* age from the base *fıırnıya* nom masc *fıırn ı s* (see Gabelentz and Lowe Grammar p 75 e) so *unhıırnı tha* impurity from the base *unhıırnıya* impure. The following are examples of this class of words in the Old High German (where *d* occurs for the Gothic *th* according to § 87) *hıırnı da* purity *herdı da* hardness *sıımfıı da* softness *sterchı da* strength (see Grimm IV 242). In English the following words belong here *heal th* *heıg th* *leıg th* *lep th* and some others. The New High German exhibits these formations only in local dialects as in the Hessian e.g. *Lang de Tief de Breite de* the latter answering to the Sanscrit *prıthu ta* and Greek *πλατυ τηρ*. With the suffix under discussion the German languages form also abstracts out of the themes of weak verbs e.g. in Gothic *sııegnı tha* joy exultation (*sııegnıya* I exult) *mıırnı tha* notice rumour (*mıırnıya* I announce) *vıırgı tha* condemnation (*ga vıırgıya* I condemn). Here the *ı* is the contraction of the class syllable *ya* (=Sanskrit *aya* see § 109 6) as in the preterite and passive participles as *sok ı da* I sought *sok ı ths* sought. So in Old High German e.g. *hıını da* scorn (*hıınıu* I scorn) *hıırı da ga hıırı da* hearing (*hıırıu* Gothic *haus ya* I hear). The Gothic *gaunđ tha* mourning complaint (*gaun đ* I sorrow preterite *gaun o da*) is the offspring of a verb of Grimm's 2d weak conjugation. This ı solitary example of its kind which first came to light by the publication of the translation of the Pauline Epistles (2 Cor vii 7) confirms the opinion that the *ı* which in all other places precedes the *th*

belongs not, as is commonly supposed, to the derivative suffix, [G Ed p 1169] but to the primitive base, as I should have assumed even without the form *gaunô-tha*, "to know."*

830 Bases ending in a consonant add, in order to lighten the combination with the consonant of the suffix, in some words in Latin, an *i*, in Greek universally an *o*, hence, *e g* *virgini-tât*, *capâci-tât*, *felici-tât*, *μελανό-τητ*, *χαρισιτό-τητ*, in opposition to such words as *juven-tât*, *juven-ta*, *juven-tûl*, *volun-tât*, *senecta*, *senec-tûl*, *vetus-tât*. To the latter corresponds, in Gothic, the solitary specimen of its kind, *yun-da*, "youth," = Latin *juven-ta*, with the contraction, however, which the Sanscrit sister-word *yuvan* has experienced in the weakest cases (*e g* gen *yûn-as*, Latin *yûn-ê*, see § 130), and the Latin in the comparative (*jun-ior*). With regard to the inorganic affix *ga* of the base *yugga* (= *yunga*), whence we might have expected *yuggi-tha*, see § 803. The *d* for *th* in *yun-da* must, I believe, be ascribed to the influence of the preceding *n*, although this liquid admits also of the combination with *th* †

831 In no province of European languages has the type of Sanscrit abstracts, as *śuklâ-tâ*, "whiteness," *bahû-tâ*, "plurality," been retained so truly as in Slavonic. In order to see this, we must not, with Dobrowsky (p 299), assume a suffix *ota* for words like *dobrota*, "goodness," but must place the *o* on [G Ed p 1170] the side of the primitive base, to which it in fact belongs, therefore *dobro-ta*, not *dobr-ota*. So among

* "Influence of the Pronouns on the formation of Words," p 22. I had in view there only the forms in which the *i* exhibits itself as the weakening of the *a* of the primitive base, as in *dupi-tha* from *dupa*. The explanation of the *i* as the contraction of the syllable *ya* in forms like *farni-tha*, "age," for *farn-ya-tha*, is here given for the first time.

† See § 91. The feminine Sanscrit suffix *ti*, which is there spoken of, shews itself three times in the shape of *di* after *n* (*ga-mun-di*, "money," *ana-mun-di*, "conjecture," *ga-kun-di*, "persuasion"), and twice in the form of *thi* (*ga-kun-thi*, "appearance," *ga-mam-thi*, "community")

others also: *śāṭṇōta ślyepo-la* blindness *tenaōta teplo-la* warmth *tyesno-la* narrowness *nago-la* nakedness from the indefinite adjective bases *ślyepo* (nom masc *śāṭṇōt ślyep f ślyepa n ślyepo*) *teplo tyesno nogo* the final *o* of which is the legitimate representative of the Sanscrit *a* (see § 257) For comparison with the *nago-la* just mentioned the Sanscrit would present the form *nagna-lā* if *nagna* naked did not prefer another suffix for its abstract. The adjective bases in *yo* (see § 258) which according to § 255 *n* change this syllable to *ye* or *e* form abstracts in *ye-la* or *e-la* *cyg* *coykrta suye-la* vanity from the base *sayo* nom *coyñ sui* empty Dobrowsky (p 300) assumes for this class of words a suffix *ela*

832 In the Veda dialect there is a suffix *tati* which is used for the formation of denominative abstracts of the feminine gender just as much as *lā* and these agree with those in *lā* also in this that they accent the final syllable of the primitive base *eg arishtatātī s* invulnerableness, from *arishṭa* unwounded (here with a meaning equivalent to invulnerable) *ayakshmatātī s* health from *ayakshma* healthy (void of illness *yákṣma* and *yakṣman* consumption) *rasatātī s* riches from *rasa* treasure wealth, *dévātātī s* sacrifice (originally godhead divinity) from *deva sarvatātī s* allness entireness the whole * from *sarva* every all *santātī s* luck from [C Ed p 1171]

* On this *sarvatātī* is based the above mentioned (p 211 § 207 Note † and p 229 § 214 Note) Zend *haurvatat* which I there without knowing its Sanscrit prototype and especially the Vedic suffix *tati* have translated "entireness," and in fact for this reason because I thought I recognised in its suffix as also in that of *am i tat* an affinity to the Sanscrit *tī* Greek *τη* and Latin *ti* regarding which however I had no occasion to deliver my sentiments more closely because this circumstance belongs to the doctrine of the formation of words (see Burnouf, *Yaçna*, p 102 Note) As, according to Pinini IV 4 142 *sarvatātī* has the

śam of the same meaning. As regards the origin of the suffix *tāt*, I have scarce any doubt of its connection with the more simple *tā* (§ 829), whether it be, as Aufrecht conjectures ("Journal of Comparative Philology," p 162), that in the appended *ti* the suffix is contained, which is employed for the formation of primitive, *i e* verbal abstracts, of which hereafter, or that the *tāt* is a simple phonetic extension of *tā*; so that *ti* is properly only the repetition of *tā*, with the weakening of the *ā* to *i*, according to the principle of aorists, like *āpipam* for *āpāpam*, from *āp* (see § 581.), and of reduplication-syllables like *ti*, *pi*, for *tā*, *pā*, in *tīsh-tāmi*, "I stand" (§ 508), *pīpāśāmi*, "I wish to drink," from *pā* (§ 750). It might be also possible that at first only a *t* was added to the suffix *tā*, in the same way as to roots with a short final vowel, and in Greek to those with a long final vowel, where they are found at the end of composites a *T*-sound is added as a support. The *i* of *tāt* would, under this view of the subject, which pleases me best, be only an off-shoot of later growth, and the forms in *tāt*, which occur occasionally in the Vêdas | must consequently

[G Ed p 1172] be recognised as the oldest. The analogous Zend abstracts in *tāt* would not, therefore, have lost any *i* belonging to the base, but only dispensed with a more modern affix, which would also have remained aloof from the Greek and Latin, in case that the final *T*-sound of the suffixes *τητ*,

same signification as its primitive *śaiva*, we may regard the "entireness, totality" as tantamount to "the all, the whole."

Of this more hereafter. With regard to the Greek compounds like *ἀγνώ-τ*, *ἀποβρώ-τ*, and especially with regard to the inclination of the Greek to extend bases ending in a vowel by the addition of *τ*, see Curtius, "*De nominum Græcorum formatione*," p 10.

† Benfey (Glossary to the S V) quotes several cases of *dēvatāt*, and Aufrecht (l c p 163) adduces from the 2d book of the Rigveda the locative of *viśātāt*, "persecution," which presupposes for the primitive *viśa* (commonly "wolf") the meaning "following, pursuer."

tut tut is in heir loom brought from their original Asiatic home and has not first sprung up on European soil. It would however be surprising if the suffix under discussion in Greek Latin and Zend had sprung from the form *tāt* but the final *t* in the three languages just named had been lost without leaving a trace as this vowel elsewhere in Greek and Zend at least has never allowed itself to be displaced in the classes of words in *t* which are common also to the Sanscrit. The abstracts in *paup* *tāt* (*paup tāt* according to § 39) which have hitherto been discovered in Zend are besides the frequently-mentioned *haurratāt* eternity and *amerētāt* immortality * *uparatāt* superiority (see Burnouf *Yaçna* p 255) from *upara* superior (see Sanscrit *upari* over Gothic *ufar* 9c) *dratāt* firmness (Burnouf *Etudes* p 261) from *dria* firm = Sanscrit *dhriva* (Old High German *tru* true) *paouratāt* anteriority (*Yaçna* p 293 Note 111) from *paouria* anterior † = Sanscrit *purra*, *ustatāt* greatness (Aufrecht *Journal* p 167) from *usta* high great = Sanscrit *uttha* standing up raising oneself (see § 102) for *utstha* *paupwawab* *tanhutāt* riches (Aufrecht l c) = Sanscrit *ra* *rutāt* (see beginning of this §) *yaratāt* duration from *yara* idem (Burnouf *Etudes* p 9) *paupwawab* *arstāt* perhaps the Vedic *arishtatāt* (see beginning of this § and Brockhaus Glossary) *rasantāt* according [G Ed p 113] to Anquetil droiture of uncertain derivation whence the signification also is uncertain |

*

* I regard *amērē* as = Sanscrit *amara*, 'immortal. The word therefore in Vedic form would be *amarātāt* or *amarātāt*. Regarding *haurratāt* see beginning of this § Note

† *Rasans* is according to the form a participle present, and signifies perhaps "shining" and its abstract lustre. Compare *ras* which lies at the root of the Sanscrit *rasmi* beam of light which does not elsewhere occur but is probably related to *lav* to shine

833 If the Sanscrit suffix *tâti* or *tât*, as a formative of denominative abstracts, is really old, and if it existed in the period before the separation of languages, we may then refer to it another suffix from the province of the European sister-languages, and one which is likewise feminine, viz *duthi*, nom *duth-s*, the use of which, on the presupposition that it is short, would be to be so regarded as that the long *â* had first been shortened and then weakened to *u*, as, *e g* the *u* of Anglo-Saxon nominatives of Grimm's first strong feminine declension (*gifu*) answers to the Gothic short (*giba*) and Sanscrit long *â* (§ 137.) As regards the consonants, the law of the mutation of sounds in Gothic would lead us to expect *thuthi*; but in accordance with what was remarked at § 91, we cannot be surprised that in the former place the old tenuis has been changed to a medial instead of to an aspirate. Formerly in this class of words *ayuk-duth(i)-s*, "eternity" (see Grimm, II 250), from a to-be-presupposed adjective base *âyuka*, nom masc *ayuk-s*, stood quite isolated. But now the sources of language which have been lately discovered supply us with the bases *manag-duthi*, "a crowd" (nom *-duths*, 2 Cor viii 2), and *mîkil-duthi*, "greatness" (gen *mîkil-duthar-s*, acc *mîkil-duth*, Skeir). From the final *i* of the Gothic suffix, in case of

[G Ed p 1174] its being really connected with the Vêdic *tâti*, *tât*, one must not, however, deduce the inference that *tâti* is necessarily the elder form, for the Gothic could easily further add to the *T*-sound, as the original final letter of the suffix, an *i*, as the declension of consonants, with the exception of *u* in Gothic, and generally in German, is not a favourite, and the lightest vowel *i* is readily applied to transfer a

* After removing the suffix *ka*, we may so compare *ayu* with the more simple base *awa*, nom *aw-s*, as supposing that the syllable *ia* has been contracted to *u*, and then that the *i*, on account of the vowel following, has passed into its semi-vowel

theme terminating in a consonant to a more convenient order of declension hence *eg* to the Sanscrit base *chnt-* *īdr* 4 (see § 312) answers in Gothic *fidvōri* (dat *fidvōri m*) and the bases *shash* 6 *snptan* 7 *nnian*, 9 *dasan* 10 in Old High German form their declension from *schsi sibunt nunt ~chan*. If Grimm (II 230) is right as I am much inclined to believe in conjecturing an affinity between the Gothic suffix under discussion and the Latin *tudo tudin* is we should also be able to compare this suffix with the Sanscrit Zendian *tut* or *tāti*. We must therefore regard *tut* (in *ser utut* &c) as = the Vedic Zendian *tāt* (see § 632) and lengthened to *tudo tudin* with the weakening of the second *t* to *d* (see § 622). The addition *ōn in is* would be less surprising as the Sanscrit suffix *ti* also of which hereafter is lengthened in Latin by a similar morphic addition and *eg* the base *pak ti* has become *coc tūōn*. From *tudō* we should expect in the genitive *tudōn is* but the *ō* = Sanscrit *d* (see § 139) has with the increase of the form been weakened to *i* as in *homin is* (old *hemōn is* see p 1077).

Remark —The Vedic suffix *tati* forms not only abstract but has at times also the signification making maker (Pāṇini IV 4 142) and indeed it likewise accents the syllable preceding the suffix. An example is afforded in the Rigv I 112 20 where the masculine dual *sāntati* happiness maker or perhaps augmenter of happiness is explained by *Sāyana* by *sukhasya kartārau gaudū factores*. In words of [G Ed p 115] this kind on whose age a doubt is cast by their not being represented in the European sister languages *tāti* is perhaps from a different origin from that whence it springs when it appears as a formative of abstract substantives. We might recognise in it a derivative from the root *tan* 'to stretch' without on that account extending as Bensey does this explanation to the suffix of abstracts also although the accentuation of both kinds of words is the same since perhaps the accentuation of the preponderating abstracts has exerted an influence on that of the concretes after that the feeling with reference to the difference of origin had been extinguished. But if in the concretes in *tāti* a derivative of the root *tan* 'to extend' be contained I would then in certain cases, prefer to recognise a noun of agency rather than an abstract for although *ti* be no

regular suffix for the formation of nouns of agency, it nevertheless forms several appellatives, which, according to their fundamental signification, are nouns of agency, as, e g *tantī-s*, “weaver,” properly “stretcher,” *krishī-s*, “man,” as “plougher” (Vêda). According to this, the before-mentioned *śāntātī-s* would properly mean “extender,” i e “augmenter,” or “grounder, creator of happiness,” which gives a more satisfactory sense than if it be taken, instead of as dependent compound, as possessive, according to which it would signify “having the augmentation of happiness,” which sense is not suitable in the passage of the Rîgvêda that has been cited. But when, in a passage of the Yajurvêda (VII 12), the Scholiast Mahîdhara takes *jyêshthâtâtī* as an actual possessive (which, however, is not confirmed by the accentuation), in that he explains *tâtī* as being a derivative from *tan*, “to extend,” and therefore, according to the sense, as = *visâra*, “extension,” we cannot thence infer that he recognises in the words formed by the suffix *tâtī* in general, or in any particular branch of them, possessive compounds with *tâtī*, “extension,” as the last member of the compound, for he adds to the explanation above given another and a more satisfactory one, and explains *jyêshthâtâtī* as a simple word formed by the suffix *tâtī*, when he refers to Pāṇini, V 4 41, according to which the suffix under discussion, in combination with *jyêshtha*, produces only a strengthening (*prasānsâ*, properly “extolling”) of the meaning of the original word, and therefore *jyêshthâtâtī-s* would be equivalent to “the best of all,” or “the notoriously best.” If we wish to confirm this signification of the (according to Pāṇini) isolated in its kind *jyêshthâtâtī*, by the circumstance of its being in its origin a possessive

[G Ed p 1176] compound, we must then assign to it the meaning, “the extension” (as it were, “most highly potent”), including “the best.”

834 We may here at once notice another suffix, which in Sanscrit, just like *tâ*, *tât*, *tâtī*, forms abstracts from adjectives and substantives, viz the neuter suffix *tva*, which is probably an extension of the infinitive suffix *tu* by *a*, *tva* therefore, from *tu-a*, as the hereafter-to-be-discussed suffix *tavya* is from *tu*, with Guna, and *ya*. The abstracts in *tva* are oxytone, e g *amritatvâ-m*, “immortality,” from *amrita*, *nagnatvâ-m*, “nakedness,” from *nagnâ*, *bahutvâ-m*, as *bahû-tâ*, “multitude,” from *bahû*. This class of words has been retained with all possible exactitude, exclusive of the insertion of a euphonic *s* before the *t* of the suffix (see

§ 825) in Slavonic as *тѣ* *tia* according to § 257 in Old Slavonic could take no other form than *тѣ*, and the nominative *тѣмъ* in like manner could be nothing but *тѣ*. The final vowel of the primitive base is rejected in Slavonic hence *ѣ* *g* *дѣвство* *djev-stvo* maidenhood from *дѣвѣ* *djeva* maiden *вдовство* *vdov-stvo* widowhood from *вдова* *vdola* widow *лѣнство* *lkan-stvo* cunningness from *лѣнливъ* *lkanliv* cunning *достоинство* *dostoin-stvo* worth from the adjective bases *лѣнливъ* *lkanliv* cunning *достоинъ* *dostoin* worthy (see Dobrowsky p 303) The Gothic in the only word which belongs here has changed the old tensus of the suffix *тѣ* *tia* to *d* instead of into *th* as in *fidjur* four = चत्वार *chatvār* (§ 312)—I mean the neuter base *thura dva* serfdom nom ace *thi di* from the primitive base *thia* nom *thiu* ; serf

835 In the Veda dialect *tia* occurs also as primary (Krit) suffix in the sense of the cognate *taiya* and forms from *kar* *kri* to make the paroxonytised *kartra* = *kartaiya* *faciendus* as neuter substantive (nom ace *kārtva m*) work as being to be done So in Zend [G Ed p 1117] *berethua* *ferendus* * Here belong in my opinion the Old High German masculine substantive bases in *don* (nom *do*) for the most part abstracts as *e g* *suep-i* *do* (or *du*) *sopor* *irr a do* *err i-do* *irr-e-do* *error* *yuch i do* *yuk i do* *prurigo* *hol θ do* *foramen* the intermediate vowel of which I assign to the class syllable of the verb The *v* of the Sanscrit suffix *tia* is dropped in the Old High German with reference to which we may note also the still more marked abbreviation of the numeral *fior* compared with the Gothic *fidjur* and Sanscrit *chatvār* as The Gothic has retained the semi vowel in the suffixes which belong here *tva* neut (nom *tv*) from *vaur* *ti*

Comparative with the prep *upa* *upa b r thwōlara* (V S p 290 s c Burnouf Etudes p 210)

"work," *thō*, fem (nom *thra*, see § 137), from *jē-a-thra* "love," | *jī-a-thra* (for *jy-a-thra*), "enmity," † *sal-i-thra*, pl. "harbour" (*sal-ya*, "I turn in, remain," pres *sal-i-tha*). Old High German *sal-i-tha*, *sal-i-da*, *sal-i-tha*; *tōn*, fem (nom *tō*, see §. 112), from *rah-tō*, "watch," *ga-tō*, "street" (Sanskrit root *gā*, "to go"), Old High German *ga-za* (*ga-w*, "I go"), *uh-tō*, "morning, twilight," (Sanskrit *uśh*, "to burn, to give light," *uśhās*, "aurora") Here belong also, I have no doubt, some Slavonic abstract feminine-bases (together with nominatives) in *ta* which Dobrowsky (p. 286) reckons with the formations in *ra*, since he derives them, not from the root, but from the infinitive in *ti*, e.g. *skytati*

[Ĝ Ed p 1178] *shan-ta*, "mowing, harvest," (Латин *shynun*, "to cut down" КЛАНТА *klan-ta*, "excration," (Латин *klynun*, "excree"), ЛОВИТА *lov-i-ta*, "venatio," (*lov-i-ti*, "captare") I now prefer to deduce also the above-mentioned (§ 507) Lithuanian abstracts in *ba*, *bė*, and the abstracts in *ba*, which so frequently occur in the Slavonic dialects, from the Sanskrit suffix *ta*, i.e. from its feminine *tō*, and, in fact, so as to assume, after the *t*-sound is dropped, a hardening of the *v* to *b*, with regard to which I would recall attention to the relation of the Latin and Zend adverb of number *bis*, and that of the *bi*, which appears in both languages at the beginning of compounds, to the Sanskrit *dvīs*, *dvī* (see p 424) From adjective-bases spring, in Slovenian, among others, the following feminine abstracts *sladko-ba*, "sweetness," from *sladek(o)* "sweet," *gordo-ba*,

* It springs, perhaps, from *varth*, "to be" (*vantha*, *varth*, *vaurthum*), with *s*, therefore, for *th*, according to § 102 p 102

† From *fryō*, "I love," might be expected *fry-ō-thra*, yet the shortening of *ō* (= *ā*) to *a*, according to § 69, cannot surprise us.

‡ We might have expected *jy-ai-thra*, but only the first part of the diphthong of the class-syllable *ai* has remained, as in *jy-a*, "I hate," *jy-a-m*, "we hate," for *jy-ai*, *jy-ai-m*

ugliness from *gerd(o)* ugly *gnyilo ba* rottenness
 from *gnyil(o)* rotten *tesno-bo* narrowness from *tesen* *
 narrow

836 The perfect passive participle is in a comparatively small number of roots formed by the suffix *na* which is always united directly to the root and like the more prevalent *ta* has the accent. The following are examples *lu na s* disengaged forcibly *bhug ná s* bent (root *bhuy*) *bhag ná s* broken (root *bhañj*) *bhin na s* cleft (from *bhid na s*) *stir na s* spread (root *star* स्तृ *stri*) *pur na s* filled up (root *par* पृ *pri*)† To these correspond in respect of accentuation also the likewise few in number Greek formations in 10 feminine *νη* as *στειγνος στεγνο-ς* [G Id p 1179] *σεμιο-ς* (for *σεβιος*) *αλαπαδνο-ς* *ισχνο-ς* *σπαριο-ς* *φερνη σκηνη* (Sanskrit *चक्ष* *chhanna s* from *chhadna s* covered (see § 11) *τεκνο ν* which has the accent thrown back. In Latin belong here besides *ple nu s* *eg e-nus* (with active signification) *regnum* several words which from a Roman point of view are of obscure origin (see Pott II p 570) as *magnu s* properly grown (Sanskrit *mah manh* to grow whence *mahánt mahat* great), *lignu m* as kindling (Sanskrit *dah* to burn) *tignu m* as hewed (Sanskrit *taksh* to break to cleave *dignu s* properly shewn marked out (Sanskrit *dis* from *dik* to shew Greek *δεικ*) Perhaps *signu m* is connected with the Sanskrit root *sāñj* Lithuanian *sej* to affix so that it would properly signify the affixed

837 In German this suffix has extended itself over all the strong verbs but in such a manner that it is not as

* See Metciko (p 44), who however in imitation of Dobrowsky's example assigns the *o* (*o strolled through*) of the adjective base to the derivative suffix (*oba*)

† In the two last examples *n* stands for *n* through the influence of the preceding *r*

in Sanscrit, Greek, and several Latin expressions which belong here, joined directly to the root, but by the intervention of a conjunctive vowel *a* (later *e*, Old Northern *i*), hence, e g. in Gothic, *bug-a-n(a)-s*, "bent," (for Sanscrit *bhug-ná-s*, (from the root *bug*, *^* (*bhuga*, *baug*, *bug-u-m*)). The denominatives discussed above (§. 770) point to an older period in which the *n* of this passive participle plays an important part,

[G Ed p 1180] but is joined direct to the root | In the Slavonic languages the suffix beginning with *n* of the perfect passive participle has obtained still wider diffusion than in the German dialects. The old Slavonic verbs which are based on the Sanscrit 1st class, exhibit, in the place of the original *aya* before the participial suffix under discussion, either *a* (*a*), or *ye* (*ye*), or *ie*, e g. *глаголю* *glagol-a-n'*, "said," *зрю* *zryu-n'*, "seen," *волю* *vol-ye-n'*, "willed," (see § 767). The verbs which are based on the Sanscrit 1st class add to the root, as in most of the persons of the present, an *e*. Compare *несу* *nes-e-n'*, "boine," fem *nes-e-na*, neut *nes-e-no*, with *несу* *nes-e-shi*, *nes-e-ty*, *nes-e-m'*, *nes-e-te*, *nes-e-va*, *nes-e-la*. Perhaps, however, in this class of verbs the *e* is not the old class-vowel, but an insertion of later date, like the *a* of the corresponding Gothic participles. It is to be noticed, with regard to the

* It is an oversight, that, in § 770, the *a* preceding the *n* is identified with the class-vowel, for were the class character retained in the passive participle, in that case the verbs (see § 109^a 2) belonging to the Sanscrit 4th class would retain the syllable *ya*, the passive participle of *huf-ya*, "I raise," would be *haf-ya-n-s*, not *haf-a-n-s*. Thus, from *vahs ya*, "I grow," the participle under discussion is *vahs-a-n-s*, not *vahs-ya-n-s*, where it is to be observed, that in neuter verbs this participle has in the German languages, as in Sanscrit, an active meaning, thus, *vahs-ya-n-s*, "qui crevit."

† A direct junction of the suffix is found also in the adjective *us-luk-na-s*, "open," properly "unlocked," so the neuter substantive-base *bar-na*, nom *barn*, "child," as "boin" (like *τέκνον*), compared with the actual participle *baur-a-n-s*.

verbs belonging to the Sanscrit 1st class that in Sanscrit also the character *aya* (dropping only the final *a*) extends over the special tenses. This too is the case in German with the corresponding affix of the weak conjugation. It is surprising that the Lettish languages although they border next on the Slavonic are nevertheless distinguished in the case of the participle under discussion that they employ the suffix *ta* more constantly than the latter do the suffix *no* fem *na*. In the Lettish languages however analogous forms in *na s* are not altogether wanting they are however no longer conscious of their origin and pass for ordinary adjectives as e.g. the Lithuanian *silp na s* weak (weakened see *silpstu* I become weak pret *silpau*) *pil na s* (Lithuanian *pil n-s*) full [G Ed p 1161] properly filled = Sanscrit *pur na s** Zend *pērenō* fem *pērenē* for *perenō* (see § 137)

838 Just as the passive participial suffix *ta* in Sanscrit forms from substantives possessive adjectives like *phal i-ta s* gifted with fruit (see § 824) so for a like purpose is used the suffix *na* in like manner with the insertion of a conjunctive vowel: which the Indian Grammarians include in the suffix. Examples are *phal i na s* gifted with fruit *mal i na s* covered with dirt. With these agree in respect of accentuation also Grecian formations like *πεδ i νο s* (Buttmann II § 119 74) properly endued with evenness hence (1) flat even (2) living in the plain *σκοτεινο-ς* (from *σκοτεσ i νο s* see § 128) endued

* The *i* of the Sanscrit form owes its origin to the labial preceding otherwise its place would be filled by *y*, as e.g. in *st r na s* the old form however is evidently *par na s* and the true root is *par* whence *piparmi* 'I fill'. On *parna* is based also the Zend base *p rēnu* of which the first *r* is founded on the original *a* while the second is explained by § 44. The *i* of the Lithuanian *pil na s* is a weakening of the original *a* as that of *wilka s* 'wolf' compared with the Sanscrit *vrika s* from *varka s* see § 1 and Vocalismu p 160.

with darkness," $\phi\alpha\kappa\iota\nu\acute{o}\text{-}\varsigma$ (from $\phi\alpha\text{-}\kappa\sigma\text{-}\iota\text{-}\nu\acute{o}\text{-}\varsigma$), "endued with light," $\delta\phi\kappa\iota\nu\acute{o}\text{-}\varsigma$ (from $\delta\phi\kappa\sigma\text{-}\iota\text{-}\nu\acute{o}\text{-}\varsigma$), "gifted with mountains" The ϵ of $\epsilon\upsilon\delta\iota\kappa\iota\nu\acute{o}\text{-}\varsigma$ is the weakening of the α of $\epsilon\upsilon\delta\iota\alpha$, where it is necessary to recall attention to the fact, that the suffix $\omega\nu$ also is very frequently preceded by an ϵ as a weakening of the final vowel of the primitive base, *e g.* $\rho\acute{o}\delta\epsilon\omega\nu$ from $\rho\acute{o}\delta\omicron\text{-}\omega\nu$ In words which express a time, as *e g.* in $\chi\theta\epsilon\sigma\text{-}\iota\text{-}\nu\acute{o}\text{-}\varsigma$, $\eta\mu\epsilon\rho\text{-}\iota\text{-}\nu\acute{o}\text{-}\varsigma$, $\delta\rho\theta\rho\text{-}\iota\text{-}\nu\acute{o}\text{-}\varsigma$, the fundamental signification lies more concealed, but $\chi\theta\epsilon\sigma\iota\nu\acute{o}\text{-}\varsigma$ properly means no more than "with yesterday," "combined with yesterday," "belonging thereto," as our German expressions also, like "*gestrig, heutig*," contain a possessive suffix In spite of the difference of accentuation, I be-

[G Ed p. 1182] lieve that adjectives, too, like $\xi\upsilon\lambda\iota\nu\omicron\varsigma$, $\lambda\acute{\iota}\theta\iota\nu\omicron\varsigma$, $\acute{\alpha}\delta\alpha\mu\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\iota\nu\omicron\varsigma$, are not distinguished in their formative suffix from the oxytone forms in $\text{-}\nu\acute{o}\text{-}\varsigma$, but that the language only aims at bringing these expressions prominently forward with more emphasis, and therefore gives the more energetic accentuation (see p 1052) There occurs also, in Sanscrit, a word among the formations in *na* which accentuates not only the suffix but the primitive word, viz शृङ्गयन् $\acute{s}ring\text{-}\iota\text{-}na\text{-}\varsigma$, "horned," from शृङ्ग $\acute{s}ringa$, "horn" In Gothic the conjunctive vowel has been lengthened in the corresponding class of words to *ei* (= \acute{e} , see § 70) before which the final vowel of the base word is likewise dropped, hence, *e g.* $silubr\text{-}ei\text{-}n(a)\text{-}\varsigma$, "*argenteus*" (also $silubrius$, Math 27 3), $fill\text{-}ei\text{-}n(a)\text{-}\varsigma$, "*pelluceus*," $luhad\text{-}ei\text{-}n(a)\text{-}\varsigma$, "*lucidus*;" $suny\text{-}ei\text{-}n(a)\text{-}\varsigma$, "*verax*," from the bases $silubri$ (nom $silubi$), &c, $suny\acute{o}$ (nom $sunya$) The following are examples in Old High German $hulz\text{-}\acute{e}\text{-}n(a)$, "*ligneus*," $stein\text{-}\acute{e}\text{-}n(a)$, "*lapideus*," $boum\text{-}\acute{e}\text{-}n(a)$, "*arbores*," $\text{ar\ddot{o}}n\text{-}\acute{e}\text{-}n(a)$, "*arundinaceus*," $eihl\text{-}\acute{e}\text{-}n(a)$, "*queinus*," $ziegal\text{-}\acute{e}\text{-}n(a)$, "*lateritius*" In New High German the vowel of conjunction e has been weakened to e , and, after r , altogether dislodged, hence, *e g.* $eich\text{-}e\text{-}n$, $tann\text{-}e\text{-}n$, $gold\text{-}e\text{-}n$, $tuch\text{-}e\text{-}n$, $leder\text{-}n$ From plurals in *er* (out of *ir*, see § 241) spring forms like $holzer\text{-}n$,

horner n glaser n which have given occasion to misspelled forms like *steiner n* for *stein-e n* (Grimm II p 179) From the Old Slavonic here belong in respect to their suffix words like *orient ogn-e-n* fiery (fire gifted) from *ogni ognny* fire *ngedent trede n* permissions from *ngedat tred* in jury *ungent mir e n* peaceful pacific* from *ungot mir* peace, the *e* of which is evidently only a vowel inserted to combine the words and is not to be referred with Dobrowsky (p 221) to the derivative suffix In Lithuanian the conjunctive vowel of the suffix under discussion has been retained unaltered and thus words like *sidabr i na s* silvery *auks-i na s* golden *mil-i* [G Ed p 1183] *na s* merely with the suppression of the final vowel of the primitive base (*sidabra s* silver *auksa s* gold *mil tar* meal)* answer admirably to the above mentioned (see beginning of this §) Sanscrit formations like *phal i na s* mal i ná s From the bases in *na* comes by the addition of a secondary suffix the form *i na* (*ia*=Sanskrit *ya* of which hereafter) nom *ni s* for *nia s* (see § 135) gen *nio* hence *cy auks i ni s*=*auks i na s* a florin from *auks i na s* golden This derivative form however in general replaces the primitive whereby the *n* is usually doubled | Of the same signification with *sidabr i na s* silvery (also *sidabr i n y*) is *sidabr i m s* (see Rulig s v *silbern*) From *uara s* copper comes *uar' i nna s* made of copper from *youara s* beech *youar i nni-s* beechen, from *sakszna* leather *sakszn i nni s* leathern We find also the vowel of conjunction lengthened and written *y* (= *i*) and indeed in words which denote the place filled with a number of the things ex-

* Plural of *a* to be presupposed singular *multa s*

† Regarding the doubling of consonants, which often has no other meaning than that of pointing out the shortness of the preceding vowel, see Kurschat Contributions &c II p 32

pressed by the base noun, as, *e.g.* from *os̄-s*, "ash," *os̄'-y-na-s*, "ash-wood," from *ūga*, "berry," *ūg'-y-na-s*, "a place where many berries are," from *akmū* (thence *akmen*), *akmen-y-na-s*, "heap of stones." Words like *būd'-na-s*, "miserable" (properly "gifted with misery"), from *būda*, "misery," *d̄yw'-na-s*, "wonderful," ("gifted with wonder"), from *d̄yua-s*, "wondrous work," appear to have lost a vowel of conjunction, for else the final vowel of the primitive base would hardly be suppressed before the suffix. Compare Russian formations like *pyly-nyĭ*, "dusty," from *пыль* *pyly*, "dust," *muchh-nyĭ*, "mealy," from *muka*, *bolot'-nyĭ*, "marshy," from [G Ed p 1184] *boloto*, "marsh." There are, in Lithuanian, also formations in *-na-s*, with *o* as conjunctive vowel, which run parallel to those above mentioned (§ 825) in *-ta-s*; *e.g.* *viln'-o-na-s*, "to will," from *vilna*, "will," *raud-o-na-s*, "red" ("endued with a red colour"), from *raudà*, "red colour."

839 In Latin the denominative formations in *-nu-s*, fem. *-na*, which answer to the Sanscrit and Lithuanian forms in *-na-s*, stand in multifarious relations to their base word, which do not require a detailed explanation here. The originally short conjunctive vowel *i* has been lengthened, as in the older German languages, and the final vowel of the base word is suppressed, as in the sister languages.* The following are examples *sal-ī-nu-s*, *Regent-ī-nu-s*, *reg-ī-na*, *carnific-ī-na*, *doct-ī-na* (for *doctōr-ī-na*), *text-ī-nu-s*, *tonst-ī-nu-s* (from *tonstor*, whence *tonsoi*, see § 101, cf. *tonstir*), *stāgn'-ī-nu-s*, *gall'-ī-na*, *discipl'-ī-na* (for *discipulīna*), *orc-ī-nu-s*, *fer'-ī-nu-s*, *tabul'-ī-nu-s*, *pisc'-ī-na*, *mar'-ī-nu-s*, *ali'-ē-nu-s*, *lani'-ē-na*,[†] *pecu-ī-nu-s*,[‡] *bov-ī-nu-s*. The conjunctive vowel

* *i* for *ī*, to avoid two *i*-sounds following one after the other

† The retention of the organic *u* of the 4th declension, in opposition to the suppression of the other vowels, agrees with the phenomenon, that in Sanscrit also *u* is retained before the vowels of the derivative suffix in preference to the other vowels, and, indeed, with Guna increment, and with euphonic change of the *o* (= *au*) into *av*

is most commonly suppressed after *r* (as in German see § 818) hence *e g* *char nu s* *pater nu s* *mater nu s* *ier nu s* *eler nu s* *quer nu s* *inter nu s* *exter nu s* *infer nu s* *super nu s*. Also after *g* (from *c*) *solig nu s* *ilig nu s* *larig nu s* if we ought not here to divide thus *sah gnu s* and assume the dropping of the final consonant of the primitive base (see *abie-gnu s* *priri gnu s*) when *gnu s* (for *g nus* *ginus*) would signify produced (cf Pott II 586). The Indian Grammarians assume also a suffix *ina* the *i* of which is probably in like measure only a lengthened conjunctive vowel so that *i na* would be identical with the above mentioned *i na*. Examples are *sam i na s* yearly from *samā* year *kul i na s* noble (gifted with good family good descent) from *kulu m* race. The Latin *a* or *o* in words like *mont ā nu s* *urb ā nu s* *sol ā nu s* *veter ā nu s* (see *veter i nu s* *veter nu s*) *Vigent ā nu s* (*Vigent i nu s*) *oppid ā nu s* *insul ā nu s* *Rom ā nu s* *Afric ā nu s* is probably only a vowel used to connect the words so that here also only *nu* is the true suffix as *e g* *tu m* *cord ā tu s* *secler ā tu s* (see § 821) where we would recall attention to the disposition which the secondary suffix *tu* also has to be borne by a long vowel. We might however also so regard the forms *ā nu s* as though they bore the class-character of the 1st conjugation and presupposed verbal themes like *montā* *veterā* after the analogy of *amā* *laudā*.

840 As the Sanscrit bases in *a* produce not only feminines in *ā* but some also in *i* we may also regard such feminines as *indrāni* the wife of Indra *rudrāni** the wife of Rudra *varunāni* the wife of Varuna *mātulāni* the wife of an uncle by the mother's side (from *mātula*) *kshatriyāni*, wife of the Kshatriya caste as productions of the suffix *ā na* and bring them into relationship with the Latin Lithuanian and German formations which have

* *n* for *n* through the influence of the preceding *r*

been described, but in this class of Sanscrit words I hold the *ā*, not, as in Latin forms like *mont-ā-nu-s*, for a conjunctive or class-vowel, but for the lengthening of the *a'* of the primitive base, which in all the words which belong here ends in

[G Ed p 1186] *a* I divide, therefore, thus, *e g* *mātulā-nī*, for which we might also expect *mātulā nā* To these feminines correspond in Greek *θείαινα*, *λύκαινα*, *ῥαινα*, *ἄκαινα*, *μολύβδαινα*, *δέσποινα*,† from *θεανι-α*, &c (see §. 119) Feminine patronymics also, *Ἀκρισιώ-νη*, admit of being referred here, with the lengthening, therefore, of the final vowel (*o*=Sanskrit *a*) of the primitive base, as in Sanscrit, in case we ought not rather to distribute it *Ἀκρισι-ώ-νη*, and look on the *ω* as the conjunctive vowel The latter view is corroborated by Latin forms like *Mell-ō-nia*, together with *Mell-ō-na* (as it were, “the honey-bound”), *Wall-ō-nia*, *matr-ō-na*, *patr-ō-na* We divide, therefore, also *Pom'-ō-na*, *Bell'-ō-na*, *Morb'-ō-nia*, *Orb'-ō-na*, although the 2d declension, in which the *u* and *o* are interchanged at the end of the base, authorises the referring the *ō* to the primitive base

841 In Lithuanian the feminine suffix *ėnė*‡ corresponds to the Sanscrit *ā-nī*, Greek *αινα*, *ωνη*, and Latin *ō-nia*, *ōna* With respect to signification also, *e g* *broł'-ėnė*, “brother’s wife,”§ corresponds admirably to Sanscrit formations like *mātulānī*, “wife of an uncle by the mother’s side” Other Lithuanian formations of this kind are *bern'-ėnė*, “the seif’s wife,” from *berna-s*, *kalw'-ėnė*, “the smith’s wife,” from *kalw-si*

* Indian Grammarians regard *ān* in these words as an affix inserted between the base-noun and the feminine *ī*, which they call *ānuk*, where the *k* probably denotes the accentuation of *ān*

† *Δέσποινα* presupposes for *δεσπότης* a nominative masculine *δεσπο-s*, the final syllable of which we may compare with Sanscrit compounds like *nīpa-s*, “rule of men” (from *pā*, “to rule”)

‡ From *ēnia* (see p 174, note)

§ From *brok-s*, “brother,” from *broha-s*

(for *kaluya s*), *awyn ene* "the uncle's wife" from *awyna s*
asil Źne she ass from *asila s* *wilk ěně* she wolf from
wilka s In Old Slavonic corresponds *ynia ynya* or with
suppression of the *a* in the nominative *yn* [C Ed p 1187]
(see Miklosich 'Doctrine of Forms, p 12) *e g- gъыня*
rab ynya or *gъыни rab yn*, maid from *gъь rab* theme
ıabo 'servant' *богыня bog ynya* or *богын bogyn* god
dess from *bog* theme *bogo* (Dobr p 291) In Old High
German the suffix *inna* corresponds probably by assimilation
from *inya** for *ima*, so that to the S inderit feminine character
ı the common feminine termination *a* (from *ā* Gothic *o*) has
also been added (see § 120) The following are examples
gut-inna goddess *kuning inna* queen *meister inna*
mistress *wirt inna* landlady *aff inna* she ape
esil inna she ass *hen inna* hen *hund inne* (for *in*
na) a bitch In the nominative and accusative singular
exist abbreviated forms in *in* as *gutin kuningin* (together
with *gutinna kuninginna*) on which are based our new
German forms like *Gottin Konigin* (Grimm II 319) which
extend over all the oblique cases of the singular while
the plural (*Gottinnen Koniginnen*) point to a more full sin
gular like *Gottinne Koniginne* So far however as one
cannot cite ı genitive dative singular or nominative accusa
tive plurals as *gutinu* I see no reason to refer the forms un
der discussion in *in* to Grimm's 4th declension according to
which they would belong to bases in *inı* the *ı* of which must be
suppressed in the nominative and accusative singular The
Anglo Saxon genitive dative forms also quoted by Grimm
(II 319) as *gyd enne dea* can be as well explained from
the 1st strong declension as the 4th I prefer to refer
them to the 1st and take *gyden* goddess as the abbrevia

* Compare the assimilation in forms like *quellu* from *quelyu* (Grimm
I 870) which so frequently enters into the 1st weak conjugation and
similar phenomena in Lithuanian (§ 501)

tion of *gydenu*,^{*} from which Bosworth ("Dictionary of the [G Ed p 1188] Anglo-Saxon language") quotes the form *gydene* (*e* as the weakening of *u*) Important are the Old Northern forms, as *apynya*, "she-apc," and *argynya*, "she-wolf," for the support of the view, that the doubled *n* of the forms spoken of stand by assimilation for *ny*. The *y* comes by "Umlaut" from *u*, which approaches closer to the Sanscrit *ā* of *ānī* than the *i* of *inna*, which probably springs from it by still further weakening. For *wintin*, in Old High German, *wintun* actually occurs (Graff, I 932). In the circumstance that bases in *on* before the suffix *inna*, *n*, drop the final consonant of the base, together with the preceding vowel (e.g. *aff'-inna*, *aff'-in* for *affon-inna*, *affon-in*), the German agrees with a similar phenomenon in Sanscrit, where bases in *n* generally reject this consonant with the vowel preceding it before vowels and *y* of the derivative suffixes, hence, e.g. *rājhyā-m* (or, with the weaker accent, *rājhyā-m*), "kingdom," from *rājan*, "king."

842 We return to the primary suffix *na*, in order to remark, that by it and its feminine *nā*, in Sanscrit, some oxytone abstracts also are formed direct from the root, as,

* Observe that also the above-mentioned (§ 803) formations in *unya*, in Anglo-Saxon, and even in Old High German (in Keio and Is), have lost the final vowel of the base in the nominative (see Grimm, II 362), just as in New High German, through which, however, they nevertheless do not fall under Grimm's 4th strong declension, *i e* the bases in *i*. In Anglo-Saxon, on the other hand, the real feminine bases in *i* have nearly all passed into that declension, the final vowel of which ends originally in *ā* (Gothic *ō*), *i e* into Grimm's 1st declension, feminine of the strong form, and thus *dæd*, "deed," presents no single case, which we must necessarily derive from a base *dædi*, and the nominative accusative plural *dæda*, and dative *dædu-m*, belong decidedly to the 1st declension, just so the accusative singular *dæde* (like *gefe*), as the final *i* has already been dropped in the accusative in Gothic (*anst*, "*gratiam*," for *ansti*).

† According to the weak declension, see Grimm, II 319. Compare the masculine *varg'-i*, "wolf," with the Sanscrit *vīha-s* from *varka-s*.

e g यज्ञ् *yaj ña s* worship sacrifice (Zend 𐬨𐬀𐬎𐬌 *yas-no* theme, *na*) यत् *na s* effort *pras ná s*, 'question' (Zend 𐬨𐬀𐬎𐬌𐬀𐬎𐬌𐬀𐬎𐬌 *fras na* neuter *fras nē-m* see Brockhaus Glossary p 378), राक्ष *ná s* protection support, यच्छ *ñá* the request entreaty त्रिश *ñá* thirst An exception as regards the accent is to be found in *śápnā s* sleep (Zend *khaf no* see § 35) to which the Lithuanian *sap-na s* dream very well corresponds only with the rejection of the *u*. In Greek *υπιος* corresponds in Latin *somnu s* (see § 126 Note). To Sanscrit feminines like *yách ñá* corresponds irrespective of the accentuation the Greek *τεχνη*. In Latin we may perhaps refer here *ruina* and *rapina* which therefore have retained the class vowel *i* (see § 109¹) and indeed lengthened it as in general this suffix in Latin loves to have long vowels before it (*i nu s á nu s ó na*). The Old High German *louga* falsehood lying (see Grifff II 131) and the Old Saxon *huf-na* to weep to lament undoubtedly belong here. To the masculine abstracts in *ñ na* I refer the Old High German *lougin* or *loug en* negatio (Grifff I c) theme *lougin na* *loug e-na* with a vowel of conjunction inserted (cf § 837).

843 There is a close affinity in Sanscrit between the participial suffixes *ñ ta* *ñ na* and the suffixes *ñ ti* *ñ ni* which are used principally for the formation of feminine abstracts in the *i* of which I recognise the ^{*}weakening of the *a* of the pronominal bases *ta na*. The suffix *ñ ni* appears only in those abstracts whose roots in the perfect passive participle replace the suffix *ta* by *na* thus *e g* *luni s* tearing apart *gluni s* exhaustion *jir ni s* old age *há ni s* abandonment compared with the passive participles *lu na s* torn asunder *glá na s* exhausted *jir na s* aged old *hi na s* abandoned (irregu [G Ed p 1100] lar for *há na s*) to which with regard to accentuation they bear the same relation as in Greek *e g* *ποτος* to *ποτος* (see § 820). The comparison of *σπαυς* with *σπαυος*, from an

obscured root $\sigma\pi\alpha$, is closer. In Lithuanian *bar-ni-s*, "quarrel" (*baru*, "I quarrel"), is a fine remnant of this kind of formation of feminine abstracts. In Old Slavonic this class of vocables is somewhat more richly represented by words like $\mathcal{A}\mathcal{A}\mathcal{N}\mathcal{B}$ *da-ny*, "impost" (for *danu*, see § 261), $\mathcal{B}\mathcal{G}\mathcal{A}\mathcal{N}\mathcal{B}$ *bra-ny*, "war," properly "the contesting" ($\mathcal{B}\mathcal{O}\mathcal{Z}\mathcal{L}\mathcal{A}\mathcal{N}$ *boryun*, "I contend"), by transposition from *bar-ny* = Lithuanian *bar-ni-s* (Dobrowsky, p. 290). In Gothic here belong the feminine bases *lug-ni*, "a lie,"* *ana-bus-ni*, "command" (*s* for *d*, *ana-bruda*, "I command," root *bud*), *varla-viz-ni*, "subsistence," properly "welfare" (*z* from *s*, see § 86 5, root *vas*, *visa*, *vas*, *vêsum*), *taik-ni*, "sign" (originally "the shewing," e.g. $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\nu\mu\iota$, Sanscrit *dis*, from *dih*, "to shew"), *siu-ni*, "the looking, viewing," nominative *lugin'-s*, &c. (see § 135). Moreover, the suffix *ni*, in Gothic, is a common means for the formation of feminine abstracts from weak verbs, the character of which is retained before the suffix, with contraction, however, of the syllable *ya* of the 1st conjugation to *ei*, as in the 2d person singular of the imperative. The following are examples from the 1st conjugation, which is here most richly represented: *gôl-ei-n(i)-s*, "salutatio," *hauh-ei-n(i)-s*, "exaltatio," *haus-ei-n(i)-s*, "auditiô," *gamêl-ei-n(i)-s*, "scriptura." The 2d conjugation furnishes us only with *lath-ô-n(i)-s*, "invitatiô," *mit-ô-n(i)-s*, "cogitatiô," *sâlþ-ô-n(i)-s*, *unctio*. The 3d only *bau-ai-n(i)-s*, [G Ed p. 1191] "œdificatiô," *at-vit-ai-n(i)-s*, "observatiô," *midya-sleip-ai-n(i)-s*, "diluvium," *lib-ai-n(i)-s*, "vita," *lub-ai-n(i)-s*, "spes" (the verb is uncited).

844. To the Sanscrit oxytone passive participles in *ta*

* It being presupposed that the only citable accusative with two meanings, *lugin*, actually belongs to a feminine base *lugini* (see Grimm, II p. 157), otherwise the neuter of the passive participle mentioned (§ 837) has most claim to this word, and then *lugin(a)* would properly signify "the lied," and correspond to Sanscrit forms like *bhugná-m*, masculin.

correspond abstracts in *ti* which have also the accent in the radical syllable, compare e.g. *yuk-tis* joining *pak-tis* cooking *uk-tis* speech *sht-tis* state with *yuk-tus* joined *pal-tus* cooked *uk-tus* spoken *sht-tus* standing (see § 621) The following are examples of analogous abstracts in Zend *a-spen-wa-kars-tis* the ploughing (*kurstā* ploughed) *a-spen-wa-kars-tis*, the eating (see p 182) *a-pasawab-hay-yadschdu-tis* purification (see § 63)* In Gothic this feminine suffix takes according to the measure of the preceding letters of the root either *ti* or *the* or *di* (see § 91) but with *i* regularly suppressed in the nominative (see § 115) hence e.g. *ga-skaf-t(i)s* creation *gen-ga-skaf-tai-s* (see § 185), *fra-lus-t(i)s* loss *ga-baur-ild(i)s* birth *gamun-d(i)s* memory (cf Sanscrit *ma-tis* understanding meaning for *man-tis*) For examples in Old High German see § 91 p 80† In the present condition of our language at this day too there are tolerably numerous remains of this class of words as e.g. *Brunst Kunst Gunst* (see § 95) *Ankunft Zukunft Junft* (see § 96) *Macht Zucht Flucht Siecht Fahrts Schrift Schlacht* which have partly lost their plural or introduced it into the *n* (weak) declension partly however retained it on the grade of the Old High German corrupting however the *i* of the base to *e* the power of whose Umlaut (vide p 38 Note) however points to its predecessor *i* hence [C Id p 110.] e.g. *Brunste Kunste Zunfte Macht* compared with *Iahrten Schriften Schlachten* In Lithuanian here belong *pytu-tis*

* There is a misprint in the German text here in the word *ausgewähltes* where *l* is given for *h*. So too in § 637 in the German *l* is given five times for *h*, a mistake which I have inadvertently followed.

† Where however in the First Edition the word should be divided *As wait* as its *t* belongs to the root (whence *waltu*, pret *uait*) The fault is corrected in the Second Edition

“the mowing” (*pyauyu*, “I mow”), *s-mer-ti-s*, “death” (“the dying”), *pa-žin-ti-s*, “knowledge, agnition, acquaintance” (*žinnau*, “I know”), *pi-gim-ti-s*, “nature” (*gemu*, “*nascor*”) The Old Slavonic has corrupted the *z* of the suffix under discussion in the nominative accusative singular to *ь y* (see § 261), and, in general, the abstract feminine bases which belong here follow the declension of *kosty* (theme *kostī*, see p 348) The base *pa-mya-ti* (ПАМЯТИ, “memory”) I now read, according to p 1048, *pa-man-ti*, as *м* is an *a* with a nasal sound, the Slavonic *man-ti*, therefore, has this superiority over the Sanscrit *má-ti*, that it has not entirely lost the nasal of the root before the suffix Compare, also, the above-mentioned Gothic base *ga-mundī*, nom *ga-mund's* The following are other Old Slavonic abstracts belonging here, which I annex in the nominative БЛАГОДАТЬ *blago-daty*, “benefit,” СМЕРЬТЬ *s'-mry-ty*, “death” (see Mikl, “Radices,” p 52) = Sanscrit *mi-ti-s*, from *mai-ti-s*, ВЛАСТЬ *vlas-ty*, “dominion,” СТРАСТЬ *stras-ty*, “suffering” (root *strad*), ВѢСТЬ *vyes-ty*, “information” (root *vyeđ*, compare Sanscrit causal *véđyámi*, “I make to know, I inform,” from the root *vid*, “to know”) To this class of verbal abstracts belong most probably also the Slavonic and Lithuanian infinitives in *ti*, of which hereafter

[G Ed p 1193] 845 In Greek the *t* of this suffix, except in *χῆ-τι-ς*, *μῆ-τι-ς*, (=Sanskrit *má-ti-s*, Slavonic *man-ty*), *φά-τι-ς* (together with *φά-σι-ς*), *ἄμω-τι-ς* (with *ἄμω-σι-ς*, compare Sanscrit *pí-ti-s*, “the drinking”), has been retained unaltered only under the protection of a preceding *σ*. The protecting

* *Dat-y* answers admirably to the Zend *dāuti-s*, mentioned above (p 1155), from *ya ôsch-dāutis*, properly “making pure,” and to the Gothic base *dē-di* (*ē=ā*, see § 69), Old High German *tā-ti*, nom *tāt* (our *That*) The Sanscrit leads us to expect *dhā ti-s*, from the root धा *dhā*, “to place, to make”

† Miklosich (Rad, p 10) rightly compares the Sanscrit root *vardh* (from *vardh*), “to grow,” from which *vrīd-dhus* (euphonic for *vrīdh-ti-s*), “growth, increase, success”

sibilant however as in the just mentioned Slavonic formations is the euphonic representative of an original *t* sound hence *e g* $\pi\iota\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma$ (together with $\pi\epsilon\hat{\iota}\sigma\iota\varsigma$) $\pi\upsilon\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma$ (with $\pi\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$) $\lambda\eta\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma$ With respect to the weakening of the τ to σ which generally takes place after vowels, compare the same phenomenon in the 3d person singular of the conjugation in $\mu\iota$ and of the 3d person plural of all verbs as there fore $\delta\acute{\iota}\delta\omega\sigma\iota$ $\tau\acute{\iota}\theta\eta\sigma\iota$ so also $\delta\omicron\sigma\iota\varsigma$ $\theta\epsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$ After gutturals and labials with which the σ unites itself in writing to ξ ψ the weakening of the *t* sound to the sibilant is of most frequent occurrence, hence *e g* $\xi\epsilon\upsilon\hat{\xi}\iota\varsigma$ (= $\xi\epsilon\upsilon\kappa\sigma\iota\varsigma$ euphonic for $\xi\epsilon\upsilon\gamma\tau\iota\varsigma$) compared with the Sanscrit *yuk ti s* Latin *junc-tio*, $\pi\epsilon\psi\iota\varsigma^*$ (= $\pi\epsilon\pi\sigma\iota\varsigma$) for Sanscrit *pák tis* Latin *coc-tio* It admits of no doubt that in Greek the ι has obtained an influence on the τ preceding which does not indeed, prevail completely throughout but is shewn in its preferring an σ to the τ hence *e g* the opposition between $\xi\epsilon\upsilon\kappa\tau\omicron\varsigma$ $\pi\epsilon\pi\tau\omicron\varsigma$ and $\xi\epsilon\upsilon\kappa\sigma\iota\varsigma$ $\pi\epsilon\pi\sigma\iota\varsigma$ while in Sanscrit *yuk ti s* *pák ti s* *trip ti s* (satiating = Greek $\tau\epsilon\rho\pi\sigma\iota\varsigma$) with respect to the initial consonants of the suffix agree with the passive participles *yuk ta s* *pák tu s* *trip tá s* (Greek $\tau\epsilon\rho\pi\nu\omicron\varsigma$ for $\tau\epsilon\rho\pi\tau\omicron\varsigma$ see § 836) Observe that the Sanscrit in accordance with the Greek has retained the more energetic accentuation for the abstract (see § 785 p 1052) while the participle has allowed the accent to sink down upon the final syllable thus *yuk ti s* [G Ed, p 1194] compared with *yul tu s* as $\xi\epsilon\upsilon\hat{\xi}\iota\varsigma$ compared with $\xi\epsilon\upsilon\kappa\tau\omicron\varsigma$

846 In Greek from $\sigma\iota$ by the inorganic addition of an α the form $\sigma\iota\alpha$ has developed itself in similar wise as above (§ 119 p 130) we saw $\tau\rho\iota\alpha$ *e g* in $\omicron\rho\chi\eta\sigma\tau\rho\iota\alpha$ answer to the Sanscrit *tri* The extended form $\sigma\iota\alpha$ appears as has already been elsewhere remarked † to be most inclined to unite itself with forms which by derivative letters or com

* $\Pi\pi$ from $\pi\epsilon\kappa$ = Sanscrit *pach* from *pák* Latin *coc*

† Influence of Pronouns on the formation of Words, p 23

position, have enlarged themselves, while it rather avoids monosyllabic roots. We find, indeed, *θυσία*, but not *λυσία*, *φυσία*, *ῥυσία*. On the other hand, we find, *e.g.* *δοκιμασία*, *ἱππασία*, *θερμασία*, *σημασία*, *ἐπιβασία* (with *ἐπίβασις*). Externally these forms approximate to nominal abstracts, which are formed by the suffix *ια* from adjective or substantive bases, in so far as these change a *τ* which occurs in the final syllable into *σ*, as, *e.g.* *ἀκαθαρσ'ία* from *ἀκάθαρτος*, *ἀθανασ'ία* from *ἀθάνατος*.

847 In Lithuanian, also, there occur verbal abstracts, which, like the Greek in *σια*, have given an inorganic affix to the suffix *ti* under discussion, and presuppose bases in *tia*, whence, in the nominative, comes *tê* (see p 171 Note). Thus, together with the *pyt'li-s*, "the mowing," mentioned above (p 1192 G ed), there exists a *pyt'ê* of the same signification, and at the same time a masculine *pyt'is* (for *pyutia-s*, genitive *pyuchia*, euphonic for *pyutio*, see § 783 p 1016) another example is *beg-tê*, "the running." The nominal abstracts in *y-stê*, as *bagot'-y-stê*, "riches," from *bagota-s*, "rich," *yaun'-y-stê*, "youth," from *yauna-s*, "young," *diẽw'-y-stê*, "godhead," from *diẽva-s*, "God," *merg'-y-stê*, "maidenhood,"

[G Ed p 1195] from *mergà*, "maiden," represent the above-mentioned (§ 829) Sanscrit abstracts in *tâ* (compare *diẽw'-y-stê* with *dẽva-tâ*, "godhead"), but appear, with regard to their suffix, to belong to *ti*, and, like Slavonic formations, as *юноѣтъ yuno-sty*, "youth," *рожеѣтъ gore-sty*, "bitterness," have inserted before the *t* a euphonic *s*. Irrespective of this, they already answer to the Latin nominal abstracts in *tia* or *tie-s* (see §. 137), as *cani-tia*, *cani-tie-s*, *pigri-tia*, *pigri-tie-s*, *justi-tia*, *amici-tia*, *pueri-tia*, *pueri-tie-s*, the *i* of which (before the *t*) I regard as the weakening of the final vowel of the primitive base (cf p 1167 G ed). An example of a neuter belonging here is *servi-tium*. In

* See Dobrowsky, p 302, and compare the formations in *stvo*=Sanskrit *tva* (§ 834)

Latin the suffix *ti* here discussed has received as a means of formation of verbal abstracts a further extension by the addition of *on* thus *tuōn* nom *tuō* with the euphonic alterations required by § 101 = Sanscrit *ti*. Compare *e g* *loc tio* with *pal ti s* *frac tio* with *bhak ti s* *junc tio* with *yuk ti s* *fis sio* (from *fis tio* and thus for *fid tio* see § 101) with *bhīt ti s* (from *bhad-ti s*) *sta tio* with *stī ti s* *i tio* with *i ti s*. The latter hardly occurs in its simple state but exists in *sam it s* fight properly the coming together the conflict. In Latin occurs together with *i tio* also *i tu m* in the compound *m i tu m* which in its formative suffix answers to the nominal abstract *servitium*. Remarkable remains of the older formation of this class of words are supplied to us by the adverbs in *tum* (or *sum* according to § 101) which I elsewhere (which Pott *E I I* 91 has overlooked) have represented as adverbial accusatives of lost abstracts * thus *e g* *trac ti m* properly with drawing *cur si m* with running *cæ-si m* with [G Ed p 1196] hewing smiting *confer ti m* with pressing together (Sanskrit *sam bhri ti m* (from *sam bhar ti m*) see from *sambhriti* bringing together crowd) *Passum* from *pas ti m* I derive not from *pando* but with *pas sus* step (from *pas tu s*) from a lost root of going and I would bring to remembrance the Sanscrit *pad* to go (whence *pada m* step) is also *path id* whence *pathin pánthan* path (Latin *pons* see § 255 (5) p 319). The following are declinable words of the older formation *mes si s* from *mes ti-s* the mowing *tus si s* from *tus ti s* cough whether the latter be connected with the Sanscrit root *tus* to sound or with *tundo* when it would properly signify the thrusting *semen ti s* is probably derived from a noun † but is

* Influence of Pronouns on the formation of Words p 24

† From *serien* for from the denominative verb *sermino* we should expect *semin-a ti s* (compare *nomin a tum*)

to be remarked on account of the pure retention of the suffix. *Mor-s* and *men-s* have probably lost an *ir* belonging to the base (therefore from *mortl-s*, *mentl-s*) the former answers to the Sanscrit *mṛt-l-s* (from *mā-l-s*) "death," the latter to *mā-l-s* for *mān-l-s*

848 With the suffix *ti*, in Sanscrit, masculine substantives also are formed, which, according to their fundamental signification, denote the person acting, as, e g. *yá-ti-s*, "tamer, binder (of the senses)," from the root *yam*; *pá-ti-s*, "lord (ruler), husband," for *pá-ti-s* (root *pá*, "to support, to rule"), *sáp-ti-s*, "horse," as "runner," *jñá-ti-s*, "relation" To [G Ed p 1197] *páti-s* answers the Lithuanian *pati-s* in *wiesz-pati-s* (usually *-pat'-s*), the Gothic *fa-di*, noun *fath-s* (see § 90), the Greek *πόσις*, Latin *po-ti-s* To this class of words belong, further, among other words, the Greek *μάντις*, the Latin *vec-ti-s* (from *veho*), the Gothic *ga-drauh-t(i)-s*, "soldier" (root *drug*, "doing military service," pret. *drauh*, pl *drugum*), *gas-t(i)-s*, "guest," as it appears to me, as "eater,"† Slavonic *gos-ty* Here belong, further, in Lithuanian, *gen-ti-s*, "relation," and the following with a

* The root *sap*, "to follow," akin to *sach*, id (from *sah*), the Latin *sequor*, Lithuanian *seku*, "I follow," Greek *ἐπομαι*, probably denoted originally "rapid motion," as also other terms used to denote a horse, are based on the notion of rapidity Compare Weber, "Vājasanēya-Saṁhitā Specimen," II 54

† Perhaps from *jan* ("to bear, to produce"), transposed to *jñā* (compare *dhmā* with *dham*) In the Vēda dialect this suffix forms also adjectives with the signification of the participle present, e g. *vriddhi* (euphonic for *vrīdh ti*), "growing," *júshthi* (euphonic for *júsh ti*), "loving" (Rigv I 10 12)

‡ Compare Sanscrit *ghas*, "to eat," to which the Latin *hos-ti-s* also appears to belong, as, in Sanscrit, *ह* *h* and *घ* *gh* are often interchanged, and *ह* *h* is represented in Latin also by *h* In Lithuanian, *gas padà*, "house-keeping," appears, in respect to its initial syllable, to belong here, and *padà* seems to be radically akin to the Sanscrit *padā-m*, Greek *πεδό-v*. Compare also the Latin *hos-pes*

lengthening of the base by an inorganic *a* which however is wanting in the nominative (see § 135) *lues ti s* in viter (gen *luechio* root *luet*, whence *luetu* and *luechiu*

I invite) *rais ti s* head band (*rai-u* I bind), *kams ti s*, stopple (*kams-au* I stop) *ram ti s* 'support (properly the supporter *pa remyu* and *ramstau*

I support) *yau ti s* ox (Sanskrit *yu* to couple *ydu-mi* I bind) compare Latin *jumentum* Perhaps

also in the Latin nominal derivatives *caele-sti* + *agre sti s* only *ti* is the true suffix and *s* a euphonic prefix* as in the

Lithuanian formations like *yauu y te* youth and the Slavonic in *s tro* (see §§ 531 547) So the *s* of *campe stri* + *terre*

stri s *sile-stri s* might owe its introduction only to the inclination a *t* has to lean on a preceding *s* [G Ld p 1100]

so that here *tri* would present itself as the true suffix and as a development from the above mentioned (§ 810) *idr* =

Sanskrit *idr* fem *tri* If any one however would desire with Pott (l^c) to recognise in the syllable *sti* of *agre sti s*

caele-sti s the root of to stand according to the analogy of Sanskrit compounds like *dui shthas* standing in

heaven heavenly I still see no reason to recognise in the above mentioned Lithuanian and Slavonic classes of

words compounds with derivatives from the said verbal root as a euphonic *s* in the forms spoken of does not sur-

prise us more than in the Greek words *ακουστος ακουσ της ακουστικός*† The *e* of the Latin formations in *e-sti s*

and *e stri* I regard as a corruption of *i* (see § 6) occasioned by the following combination of consonants

549 The Indian Grammarians assume a suffix *ati* to

* *Dome sticus* presupposes a more simple *dome sti s* (compare Pott Lt I, II 543) and thus too, *rus ti-cus* a more simple *rus ti s*

† *τικός* presupposes abstract bases in *τι* as *σι μο s* (*β σι μ s κπλ σι μο s πτω σι μ s*) presuppose such bases in *σι* See Pape, 'Etymol Lexicon, p 140 b

explain some rare words, as, *aratí-s*, m, "wrath," and with the accent on the root, *áratí-s*, f, "fear, fare" (from the root *ar*, *√*, "to move oneself," compare Latin *ira*), *īamatí-s*, m, "the God of Love," as "spoiler" (root *īam*, "to sport"), *vahatí-s*, m, "wind," as "blower" I believe, however, that in this class of words *ti* only is the true suffix, and *a* the retained class-vowel (see p 1108) The Lithuanian presents as analogous forms *gyw-a-sti-s*, "life," and *rimm-a-sti-s*, "rest," the *s* of which is therefore euphonic. The latter answers also radically to the Sanscrit *ram-a-tí-s*, as *ram*, with the prep *ā* (*āram*), signifies "to rest" On the other hand, from *gyw-a-sti-s* (*y=ī*) we had to expect *jīv-a-ti-s* The circumstance that the said Lithuanian words form in the genitive *gywaschio*, *rimmaschio*, from *gywaschia*

[G Ed p 1199] and *rimmaschia* (*chia* euphonic for *-tia*, see § 783, p 1046), and *aie* become masculine, which the Sanscrit abstracts in *ti* never are, need not deter us from recognising the affinity of formation of the words spoken of in both languages, as similar extensions of the limits of words, as also changes of gender, are not uncommon in the Indo-European stock of languages I refer, with respect to both these points, to the Latin *in-ī-tiu-m* for *in-ī-ti-s* above mentioned (§ 847) Together with *gyw-a-sti-s*, "life," and *rimm-a-sti-s*, there exist also, in Lithuanian, some analogous masculine abstracts which exhibit *e* for *a* as the middle vowel, thus, *luk-e-sti-s*, "the writing," *mok-e-sti-s*, "paying," *rup-e-sti-s*, "care," *gail-e-sti-s*, "penitence," *pylk-e-sti-s*, "rancour" (*pykstu*, "I am wrath," pret *pykau*) In Greek we find a few analogous forms which admit of comparison with the above-mentioned Sanscrit abstract *ár-atí-s*, "fear, anxiety," in which *e* has been inserted *véμ-e-σι-s*, *λάχ-e-σι-s*, *εὐρ-e-σι-s* (see p 1098), where the agreement in accentuation is also to be noticed

850 The suffix *ni*, moreover, is, in Sanscrit, not only a means of forming feminine abstracts, but produces also

some similar appellatives which accentuate some the root some the suffix *e g* *vrish ní s* rain as impregna-
tor (n euphonic for r) * *ag ní s*, fire is perhaps an ab-
breivation of *dag ní s* (compare *dág dhum* to burn root
dah) which reaches back beyond the time of the separation
of languages as *asru* is a more recent one of *dasru* (Greek
δακρυ) *ráh ní s* in the Vêdas among other things horse
as bearing or drawing (see Benfey's Glossary) in classic
Sanskrit fire, *yó ní s* masc fem *vulva* (root *yu*
to join together) An accurately re- [G Ed p 1200]
tained analogous form to *agni s* is to be found in several
of the European sister languages in Latin *ig ní s* in
Lithuanian *ug ní s* which latter however has become
feminine while the Slavonic *ogni* *og ny* (theme *ogni*) has
preserved the gender handed down to it In Lithuanian
ni appears in some other feminine bases the root of which
is obscured thus *us ní s* thistle is perhaps originally
the sticking and radically akin to the Sanskrit *ush* to
burn (Latin *us ur*) † *szak ní s* root may be named
from to grow and be akin to the Sanskrit *sak* to
be able as conversely the Gothic *mag* I can and
mah l(i) s might conduct us to a Sanskrit root which
signifies to grow (*mah manh*) In Latin we may per-
haps further refer here *cri ní s* *pá ní s* *fi ní s* *fu ní s* and
the adjectives *lé ní s* and *seg ní s* which however are all
of them more or less obscured as to their roots *Cri ní s*
may like the Sanskrit *rô-man* for *rôh man* (see § 796) and
sirô ruha hair of the head (growing on the head)
be named from to grow (*cre sco cre vi*) inasmuch as it

* Root *varsh vrish* The Latin *verres* which is probably akin takes
its form perhaps by assimilation for *verne s*

† Thus in all probability *dygulis* prickles thorn *digsi s* 'stitch
with the needle and *deju* I stick are connected with *degu* I
burn

does not spring, as *capillus* from *caput*, from another term for the head (Sanskrit *śiras* from *kiras*, "head," Greek *κάρα*), *pā-ni-s* signifies, perhaps, "the nourishing" (Sanskrit *pā*, "to support, to nourish," compare *pa sco*), but might also have lost a final radical consonant (as, e g *lu na*, *lu-men*, for *luc-na*, *luc-men*, *ful-men* for *fulg-men*), and may be named from "to bake,"^{*} *fī-ni-s*, perhaps for *fīd-ni-s*, from *fīd*, *fīdo*, *fīū-ni-s*

[G Ed p 1201] is referred by Pott (Et I, I 251), and I believe rightly, to the Sanskrit *bandh*, "to bind," with which he also compares *fido*, *fædus*, and the Greek *πείθω* (root *πιθ*), consequently, in the latter forms, the old *a*, as in our pres *binde* (see p 106), has been weakened to *i*; while the *ū* of *fīū-ni-s* for *fud-nis* is closer to the old *a*, and compensates by its being lengthened for the consonant that has been dropped † But if *fīuns* belongs to *bandh*, the *n* might also be radical, which, however, I do not believe, as *fīdo* also, and *πείθω*, have lost the nasal, and roots which terminate in a mute with a nasal preceding dispense rather with the less important nasal than with the mute hence, in Sanskrit, e g *baddh-ā-s*, "bound" *Seg-ni-s* I hold to be akin to the Sanskrit root *say*, "adhærere," *sañy*, "affigere" (*sak-tā-s*, "affixus"). it may originally sig-

* The *p* of the Sanskrit *pach* (from *pak*), Greek *πέπω*, has been changed into a guttural in *coquo*, which does not prevent the assumption that the original labial has not been entirely lost

† Regarding the origin of the aspirates of *funs* and *fido*, opposed to the Greek *πείθω*, see § 104, and Ag Benary, "Doctrine of Roman Sounds," p 190 As regards the Greek *π* for Sanskrit *b*, we find the same relation in *πυθ*, compared with the Sanskrit root *budh*, "to know" The circumstance, that in Sanskrit, together with *bandh*, there exists another root which cannot be cited, *bundh*, cannot instigate me to refer the Latin *fū-ni-s* rather to this *bundh* than to *bandh*, but I believe that the weakening of the *a* to *u* (see § 604), which, for the reason given above, has been lengthened in Latin, has found its way into the Sanskrit *bundh*, Latin *fū-ni-s*, and Gothic *bund-um*, "we bound," for the first time after the separation of languages, from a principle common to the three languages

nify held fast held in hence slow inactive In Lithuanian *vegu* means I fasten the original *a* of which has maintained itself in *sak ti s* (gen *-tes*) clasp buckle *Le ni s* if it be akin to *λεῖος* can have *ni* only as formative suffix In Sanscrit *li cl 1* signifies *liquefacere solvere* whence *li na s solutus extinctus*, *li cl 9, adhære inhæreere insidere*

[G Ed p 1202] 851 The intermediate vowel weakening of the pronominal bases *ṭ ta ṇ na* exhibited by the suffixes *tu nu* shew that they stand in the same phonetic relation to the forms *ta na ti ni* as that in which in the interrogative the form *lu* stands to *ka li* (see §§ 386 389 390) The suffix *tu* is particularly important in Sanscrit as a formative of the infinitive and of a gerund in *tū* I have already in my System of Conjugation (pp 39 43) represented the former as an accusative with *m* as the sign of case and the latter as an instrumental and will not repeat here the grounds which induce me to regard the infinitive in all languages as an abstract substantive with the privilege of governing like the so-called gerunds and supines the case of the verb and to employ several other freedoms in construction The Indian Grammarians assign the *m* of the infinitive in *tum* to the suffix which they call *tu mun* in order to express by *n* which is joined by means of the conjunctive vowel *u* to the *tum* which they view as the true suffix the denial of the accent which rests on the radical syllable hence *e g du tum* to give *sthā tum* to stand, *pak tum* to cook, *tras tum* to tremble *at tum* to eat *vet tum* to know That the Indian Grammarians regard the final *m* of these forms not as the sign of the accusative and therefore as alien to the true suffix must surprise us the more as in the Veda dialect of which I was ignorant when I first began to treat of this subject the abstract substantive in *tu* occurs also in other cases and indeed in the dative with the termination *tavē* or *tavai* and in the

genitive-ablative with the termination *tós*. In these forms, however, the Indian Grammarians refer the case-terminations *é* or *á*, and *s* likewise, to the suffix (Pânini, III 4 9), yet we can hardly imagine it possible that Pânini, when he,

[G Ed p 1203] *e g* III 4. 13., says, *ísaré tósun-lasundú*, *i e* that in construction with *ísará*, "lord, capable," the unaccented suffixes *tós* and *as* may supply the place of the infinitive suffix *tum*, he can therein have overlooked that here *tós* is the genitive of the suffix *tu*, and *as* the genitive termination of abstract substantives without any suffix. It is, however, certain that the practical Grammarians often overlooked that which was not far to find, if it was no longer clearly perceptible in the usances of the ordinary language of the day, and if Pânini has made a mistake here, we cannot wonder that Colebrooke also, who, in his Grammar, keeps strictly to the rules handed down by the native Grammarians, should assign the formations in *tós(un)*, *(k)as(un)*, *tum(un)*, and *(k)tvā*, to the "aptotes" ("Grammar of the Sanscrit language," p 122),¹ and, *e g* place *kártum*, "to

* As regards the infinitive in *tum*, and the gerund in *tvā*, A W v Schlegel, too, has, in noticing my view of these forms (*Indische Bibliothek*, I p 125), so far assented, as to say that the assertion that the infinitive in *tum* is the accusative of a verbal noun in *tu* "has a certain speciousness," for the supine of the Latin has undoubtedly the appearance of a verbal noun of the 4th declension. As regards, however, the form in *tvā*, Schlegel very decidedly denies the justness of viewing in a gerund of the same (*i e* according to his idea) any oblique case whatever of an abstract substantive governing the case of the verb, but he will have the form in question called "an absolute participle," perhaps because it, as he remarks at p 124, when it governs an accusative, can be aptly rendered into Latin by the ablative absolute, *e g* *tan drishtvā* by *eo viso*. Though, however, *tan drishtvā* might aptly be so rendered, yet this does not prevent its properly signifying "*post-actionem videndi eum*," "after seeing him" for the instrumental, which I recognise in *drishtvā*, expresses also, where it refers to a time, the relation "after," hence, *e g* *achurēna kālēna*, "after a short (not long) time," consequently this
gerund

make *krutā* after making in the same [G Ed p 1204] class with adverbs like *lulas* whence? *yatra* where?

gerund case, where it expresses the relation 'after' is fittingly translated into other languages by a preterite participle thus e.g. *ity ukta* (after so speaking) may be rendered into Latin by "*ita locutus*, and into German by *so gesprochen habend*. We must however be on our guard if we would understand the nature of a form of speech against disposing of it according to the fashion in which it can be most conveniently rendered into another dialect without injury to the general import. As the instrumental also expresses the relation with the gerund under discussion may also be employed where a present participle might be expected and where in translations into other languages we might aptly avail ourselves of such a part of speech as e.g. Nal IX 24, 'he spake to *Blamu* with explanation i.e. explaining (compare W v Humboldt in Schlegel's I Bibl II 127) where indeed in the original we do not find the gerund in *tā* but another of which hereafter which however in its constructions agrees exactly with that in *tā* and in which too an instrumental may be recognised though not indeed as clearly. Our gerund expresses the relation with also there where it comes after *alam* enough in which position, however we more commonly find the instrumental of other abstract substantives. The forms *alam bhuktvā* and *alam bhojanena* i.e. enough with eating signify the same and I have appealed already in my Conjugation System (p 67), to this kind of construction as to a decisive proof of the instrumental and gerundinal nature of the form in *tā* and will only further add here that Forster also whose Grammar was then unknown to me regards the form in *tā* in this particular case as a gerund (Essay on the principles of Sanscrit Grammar p 463) without however entering into any explanation of its origin and of the case relation denoted by it. The use of gerunds with *alam* is very rare in authors in that as it appears the abstracts in *ana* which will be discussed hereafter and on which our German infinitive is based have almost entirely supplanted the gerunds in *tā* and *ya* in this position. I am able at present to quote only one solitary example of the gerund in *ya* with *alam* viz Mah III 869 1 *alan kṛ śna tamanyas nam(ya nam)* Enough Krishna with despising him (i.e. despise him no further). Schlegel grounds a principal objection against the formative affinity of the form in *tā* and the infinitive in *tum* on the circumstance that the two forms do not stand in such exact accordance with one another in all roots as in *paktum* and *paktva*,
but

tálhá, thus” As regards the infinitive in *tum*, the circumstance that this form does not in all places express the

but I had myself before, in my Conjugation-System, pp. 57, 58, drawn attention to the difference, as, *e g* between *vaktum*, from the base *vaktu*, and *uktvā*, from the contracted base *ul tu* and, moreover, W. v Humboldt (Indische Bibl, I 433, II 71), in a copious and profoundly penetrating examination of the disputed point, whether the form in *tiā* be an indeclinable participle or a gerund, has not been deterred by such differences from recognising in the infinitive and the form in *tvā* a formative affinity and common suffix, and from uniting with me in representing the latter as a gerund invested with the termination of the instrumental and expressing the relations of this case (I c II p 127) On the other hand, Lassen (I c III p 104) consents indeed to recognise in the form in *tvā* a gerund, but demes it to be an instrumental His objection against the original identity of the infinitive and the gerund (which, as is evident from what has been said, I have never asserted) is from the “older forms of the gerund” which occur in Pāṇini (VII I 47) Before I mention these forms, I must repeat, that, as Lassen lays down in other places, that alone is to be considered as ancient which the Vēda dialect exhibits differing from the classical Sanscrit, otherwise we must (to keep to the instrumental) regard the Vēdic instrumentals, mentioned in the Scholiast to Pāṇini, VII I 39., *dhūtī*, *matī*, *sushtutī* (for *dhity-ā*, *maty-ā*, *sushtuty-ā*), which have dropped the ease-terminations as well as locatives like *charman* for *charmani*, I c—as older than the forms of the classic language which are provided with the ease-termination After the analogy of the said Vēdic instrumentals may also be explained the Vēdic gerunds in *tvī* (e g *vitvī*, Rīgv I 52 6), if we, with Kuhn (“Journal of Lit Crit,” 1844, p 114), compare these forms with Vēdic instrumentals like *dhriṣṇuyā*, “with courage,” which I now readily do, without, however, assuming, with the said learned man, that such instrumentals come from bases in *vi*, but I hold the *y* of *dhriṣṇuyā*, *uruyā*, for a euphonic insertion (see § 43), and I refer to the analogous feminine pronominal instrumental *amu-y-ā* (“through that”) of the common language opposed to the masculine neuter *amu-n-ā* The feminine theme of the pronoun spoken of has indeed a long *ī*, except before the euphonic *y*, as, however, adjectives also can lengthen a final *u* in the feminine, so may *dhriṣṇu-y-ā* and *urū-y-ā* be derived from *dhriṣṇū*, *urū* Were it, however, preferred to derive them from *dhriṣṇvi*, *urvī*, because adjectives in *u* can annex an *i* (see § 119), we should still feel no slight ground for
assuming

recusative relation but is also found expressing relations otherwise far removed from the [G Ed p 1206]

assuming together with the pronominal base *amī*, n base *amrī* simply in order to annex thereto the terminations beginning with n vowel especially as from *amrī* according to the only rule which prevails in Sanscrit must come *amry-a amry-ō s*. If we however choose to consider the *y* in *amrī y-a, amrī y-ō s* as an insertion the inference of this recoils also upon the said Veda forms *dhṛishnu y ā uru y-a* which in the Scholiast to Panini (I c) are represented as=*dhṛishnu n ā uru n ā* and belonging to the masculine or neuter which can hardly be established by the Veda text. If the substantively used *dhṛishnuya* with courage the gender cannot be discovered from the passages of the Rigv which lie before me I regard it however, as feminine until I find proof to the contrary. The Vedic gerunds in *tiī*, if we derive the *ti* from *tu y-ā*, accord with the above mentioned Vedic instrumentals (*dhṛi* from *dhṛty-ā* &c), in so far that they in like manner have after dropping the termination changed the preceding semi vowel into the corresponding long one. But if the termination *tiī* do not rest on this principle I would explain as I have before done, *tiī* from *tiā* as the consequence of the weakening of the vowel according to the principle of forms like *yu nī mas* for *yu nā mī s* (see § 480) —The Vedic gerunds in *tiā ya* have the appearance of datives from bases in *tīa* as they however have not a dative but in like manner an instrumental meaning and also in their formation, exclusive of the affix *ya* approximate to the usual form in *tvā* but not to the above mentioned (§ 830) abstracts in *tīa* e.g. *gatiya* (Schol to Pan VI 1 46) to *gatva vṛtti ya* (Yajurveda VI 19) to *vṛttīa kṛtiāya* (I c 59) to *kṛtīa* (cf *kārtīa m* § 835) I would rather with Lunini regard *tiāya* as a lengthened form of *tīa* with the affix *ya*, than conversely with Lassen (I c p 106) look upon *tiā* as an abbreviation of *tiāya*. The lengthening of the instrumental termination *ā* to *āya* is like that by which in bases in *a* the dative termination *ē* has prolonged itself to *āya* (from *ē + a* see § 160) only the *y* here is the representative of the *i* contained in the diphthong *ē* while the *y* of *ti ya* is perhaps an euphonic insertion (see § 43) as e.g. in *ya y m* going (root *yā* suffix *m*) and in the Vedic *dīa ya s* the carrying supporting (root *dhā* suffix *as*) —Besides *tvī* and *tiāya tvānam* also (Pan VI 1 48) is named as the representative of the termination *tiā* occurring however, as added to the root *yaj* 'to honour' (*ishtīnam* for *ishtīā*) and in the scholium on the said Sutra we find also a form in *tvānam* viz *pitṛānam*

accusative, may have chiefly occasioned the overlooking
[G Ed. p 1207] its *m* to be the sign of the accusative,

for *pítvâ* If these forms, of which I know no examples that can be cited, are really equivalent in meaning to those in *tvâ*, and therefore expressive of instrumental relations, I can but recognise in their termination *nam* an enclitic, and I could only join with Lassen in conjecturing a suffix *tan*, and deriving from it *pítvânam*, after the analogy of *râjânam*, and in regarding *ishtvînam* as a weakened form of *ishtvânam*, if the forms *ishtvînam* and *pítvânam* were shewn, according to this signification, to be accusatives; but I could in nowise be induced to look upon the form in *tvâ*, which is also the prevailing one in the Vêdas, as an abbreviation of that in *tvânam* M. Professor Lassen, in his polemic against my theory with regard to the form in *tvâ*, has kept the principal point of my argument quite in the back ground; viz this, that the forms which terminate in *tvâ*, if we regard them, as Lassen does, as gerunds, express in all places, as is well demonstrated by W v Humboldt's copious investigation, only such case-relations as are denoted by the instrumental, but which are quite and entirely removed from the accusative, as also from the dative, and were this not the case, the mere form would never have led me to recognise in the formations in *tvâ* the instrumental of feminine substantives in *tu*, which, with regard to their gender and their suffix, find a good support in the Greek abstracts in *ru-s* (as *êdêrru-s*), to which I first drew attention in my treatise "On the influence of Pronouns on the formation of Words" (p 25) However, Lassen further remarks (l c p 105), that if we compare the lingual use of this gerund, the instrumental "or ablative" were perhaps better adapted for expressing the notional relation of this verbal form, than the accusative, which is never suited for that purpose Into the province of the ablative, however, in my opinion, this gerund never enters, unless one thinks of the Latin ablative, which, at the same time, represents the Sanscrit instrumental, hence, *e g* in a passage of the Bhag (II 37), *jitiâ* may be aptly translated by the ablative of the gerund (*vincendo*), thus, "*vel occisus cœlum es adepturus, vel vincendo possidebis terram*" If need be, however, I would regard here also the instrumental gerund as expressing the relation "after," "after conquering thou wilt possess the earth" A Sanscrit ablative, perhaps, *jayât*, "from the victory," or "on account of the victory," could hardly be expected in this and similar passages Still more decisively than in the passage just quoted, is the genuine instrumental relation, or that of the Latin ablative of the gerund expressed in a passage of the Hitopadés,
already

the relation of which the infinitive evidently there expresses where it is governed by verbs or verbal substantives or adjectives which express to [G Ed p 1208] will to wish to know to strive to be able to begin to command to determine where it is to be observed as regards the verbs of motion [G Ed p 1209] tion that the object of every motion in Sanscrit is regularly expressed by the simple accusative As to the accusative nature of the infinitive a passage of the Sakuntala already cited by Hofer (Of the Infinitive p 95) is very characteristic in which of two actions influenced by a verbal expression denoting beginning the one is expressed by the accusative of an abstract substantive in *a* and the other by the infinitive *bahutkshapan rodituñ cha pravrita* she began outstretching arms and to weep

already cited by me in my Conjugation system (p 45) *tvam uchchāhābdaṁ /ritā sāmnan kathan na jagarayaṣi tu clara voce clamorem faciundo dominum cur non evigilas* When Lassen (l c p 105) studiously calls the gerund under discussion indeclinable, I have nothing to say against it inasmuch as one may term any case *as such* indeclinable and so much the more those which are only the remains of the originally perfect declension of a certain class of words When however the said learned person refuses to see what can have induced me to blame those who have preceded me for calling the gerund indeclinable I must be allowed to remark that my censure chiefly consists in this that my predecessors have called this gerund not a gerund but a participle One might very well be content with an indeclinable gerund though perhaps no one would see the necessity of making especial mention of the incapability of further declension in a form which had been admitted to be a gerund As however in the form in *trā* a participle was recognised by which one had reason to expect a capacity for declension (cf W v Humboldt l c II 134) Wilkins expressly called this putative participle indeclinable and Carey 'adverbial' on the other hand Lassen in that he acknowledged the gerundial nature of the form under discussion supported the one moiety of my assertion and in the same manner as myself blamed the clothing the formations in *trā* and *ya* with the name of indeclinable or adverbial 'participles.

Such passages, too, require especial notice where one and the same verb simultaneously govern the accusative of the infinitive and that of a person, in exact agreement with the construction of the Latin and Greek accusative with the infinitive, and with similar constructions in German, as, "*Ich sah ihn fallen*" "I saw him fall" (cf Conjugation-system, pp 75, 107, and Hofer's Infinitive, p 122) Thus, Sâvitrî, V. 100 (Diluvium, p. 39), *yadî mân jîritun ichchhasi*, "*si me vivere cupis*;" Râm. ed Schl II 12 10c, *na jîritun tñn vishahê*, "*non vivere te sustineo*;" Vîrhatkathâ, p 314, sl. 172, *kam api râjânan snâtun tatra dadarîa*, "he saw a certain king bathe there" In verbs of motion the infinitive expresses at the same time the place to which the motion is directed As one, however, moves toward an action in order to execute it, the accusative termination of the infinitive here enters upon the province of the dative, which latter case, in Sanscrit, most usually expresses the causal relation, while the proper dative relation is for the most part expressed by the genitive, which in Piâkrit and Pâli has indeed quite supplanted the dative. Thus, e g Hidimba I 34., *âgatô hantum imân sarvân*, "arisen in order to destroy all these," Râm ed Schl I 20 2, *abhyayâd drashtum*

[G Ed p 1210] *ayôdhyâyân narâdhyam*, "he came to see the prince of men in Ayôdhyâ," II 97 18., *ân hantum abhyêti bharatah*, "Bharat draws near to slay us both" Hence the language may have arrived at expressing, through the accusative of the infinitive, the causal relation also, in places where it is not the object of any verb of motion, or where the direction of the motion is immediately towards a distinctly-expressed place, and the infinitive only expresses the reason of the motion, thus, e g Mah I 2876, *munin vajasan drashtun gamishyâmi tapôvanam*, "to see the immaculate hermit I will go into the wood of penitence," Hitôp (Bonn Ed) p 47 17, *pânîyam pâtum yamundâkachchham agamat*, "He went to the shore of the

Yamuna, to drink water Without a verb of motion
 Draup 4 व *alan tē pānduputrānām bhaktyā klēsam upāsītum*

Awāy with thy love to the sons of Pandu in order to bear
 distress Indraloka I 15 16 *āruhasva rathōttamam*

* *sudurlabham samārōdhum* 'ascend the best of chariots
 which to ascend (on account of the ascending) is hardly to
 be attained I now too regard the infinitive as express-
 ing the dative relation where it is by the side of words
 which express a time or by other substantives and at the
 same time it appears to represent the genitive or the Latin
 gerund in *di* as e.g. Nālis 20 is *nā yan kālō vilambitum*

this is not the time to hesitate (to the hesitating for
 the hesitating) thus Urvāsi (Lenz p 10 Bollensen p 12)

this is not the time to see Satakratus (*drashtum*) Drau-
 padī III 7 The time has approached for these most ex-
 cellent heroes to come here (to the or for the approach)
 Hitop ed Bonn p 59 line 6 *sthātum icchhā* the wish to
 stay (not of staying) Ram ed Schl II 9 7 *srōtuñ*
chhandah the wish to hear Māh 1 422 [G Ed p 1211]

pāndavān hantum mantrah the plan to slay the Pandavas
 (for the slaying on account of the slaying not of the slay-
 ing) Hitop ed Bonn p 119 Sl 40 *yoddhum sat tih* the
 power to fight Arjuns return 9 6 (Diluvjūm p 111)

antaram padād vichalitum padam room to move foot
 from foot Observe that the ordinary accusative also

occasionally expresses the relation of the cause or of the
 object as Bhāgavad Gītā XVI 3 4 5 *sampadan, dāivim*

abhyātō si to a god like destiny art thou born Con-
 versely we sometimes find the dative of common abstracts

in constructions where the infinitive was to be expected in
 its genuine accusative function I have already in a Note

to Arjuns journey to Indras heaven (p 79) drawn
 attention to such a use in *upa kram* to begin to com-

mence We read viz Hidimba I 22 *gamanāyō pachak-*
ramē he began to go (to the going or on account of

the going," instead of "the going," so Râm ed. Schl I. 29. 26)* Still more important is another passage of this kind (Mahâ-Bhâr III. 12297.), where the dative dependent on *upa-kram* governs the accusative exactly after the manner of an infinitive, *astîdmi . . . darśandyaô 'pachakramc*, "he began to survey the aims" Similarly we find *abhi-rôchay* (causal of अभिश्च *abhiwuch*), "to be pleased, to will, to wish," with the dative of abstract substantives instead of the infinitive standing in the accusative relation; e g Râm ed Schl I 36 2., *gamanâya 'bhirôchaya*, "he [G Ed p 1212.] pleased to go" (to the going, instead of, "the going," *actionem eundi*) So also *utsah*, "to be able," in which again the remarkable circumstance occurs, that, in the example before me the dative governed by the said verb, viz *paribhôgâya*, "to enjoy" ("to the enjoying"), like the ordinary infinitive *paribhoktum*, governs an accusative, Mah III 16543, "Thee, O Marthulî, I cannot enjoy" (*tvâm . . nô 'tsahé paribhôgâya*) So we sometimes find the dative expressing the place towards which a motion is made, for which purpose the accusative is altogether and specially employed, e g Mah II 2613, *vanâya pravaviguh*, "they went forth to the wood," III 10076, *âśīamâya gachchhâva*, "we go (both of us) to the hermitage." On the other hand, we find precisely in its place the dative of abstract substantives as representative of the infinitive in the causal relation, e g in a passage ("Arjuna's Journey to Indra's heaven," p 74) of the 12th part of the Mah., already elsewhere quoted, "in order to dwell (*vâsâya*) twelve years in the wood (went he)," Draup 8 20, "Sura-tha sent to slay Nakula (*vadhâya nakulasya*), the most excellent of the elephants," Schol. to Pânini, II. 3. 15,

* We find, however, also the infinitive in construction with *upakram*, e g Indralôka, I 21, *tam âprashtum upachakramc*, "he began to take leave of him."

pākaya vṛjayati he goes to cook (in order to cook)
Urvasi (Lenz p 4 Boll p 5) *yatiśhyé vah śakhīpratyāna*
yāya I will strive to bring back your friend It de
 serves notice that the abstract substantives which in
 classical Sanscrit intrude upon the functions of the infinitive
 are all except the proper infinitive in *tu m* formed
 by the suffixes *ana* or *a* to which I particularly draw atten
 tion for this reason that we afterwards meet with the
 same suffixes slightly corrupted in the European languages
 also

852 We very often find the abstracts [G Ed p 1213]
 which are formed with *ana* in order to express the causal
 relation of the infinitive in the locative which in Sanscrit
 especially very frequently stands for the dative Such infi
 nitive locatives after the manner of ordinary substantives
 regularly govern the genitive as *e g* *Savitri* I 33 *bhartur*
anūśhane tvā hasten to seek a spouse (in the seeking
 of a spouse or on account of the seeking) *Nal* 24 2
upāyah anayanē tva the means of bringing thee
 hither (to the bringing hither of thee), 17 2 *nalasya*
nayane yata strive to bring Nala here 34 *yatadhvan*
nalam arjanē strive ye to seek Nala (in the searching
 of Nala) * *Mah* 3 1478 *na tv abhyanuyñān lapsyāmi*
gamanē yatra pandarāḥ I shall not however obtain per
 mission (thither) to go where the Pandavas As the
 dative of abstract substantives is found representing the
 accusative relation so is also the locative of the form in
ana and indeed in the example before me it is governed by
sak to be able with which in general usage we find the
 infinitive in *tum* but *Ram* ed Schl I 66 10 *na śkur*
grahanē tasya dhanushah they could not receive this bow
 (in the receiving this bow) with which may be com

* On the other hand the same verb with the form in *tum* *Nal* 15 4 ,
sarvan yatishy tat kartum all this will I strive to do

pared the above-mentioned (G. ed. p 1212) *nó 'tqzhé paribhógāya* As in the passage mentioned this *paribhōga* governs an accusative, so also is the form in *anē* occasionally found with an accusative, but hitherto I know of no parallel example to place by the side of that already quoted elsewhere ("Arjuna's Journey," &c, p 80) It

[G Ed p 1214] occurs Nalus 7 10, *tam . . . suhṛīdān na tu kaśchana nṛāranē 'bhavach chhaktó dīvyamānam*, "but none of his friends was capable of restraining him (in the restraining) playing" It is more rare to find the locative of a substantive formed by the suffix *a* as representative of the infinitive One example occurs, Rāghu-vaṇśa, 16 75, where, however, it is uncertain whether *tadvichayé* be to be taken as a compound, or whether *tad* be an accusative neuter, governed by *vichayé*, "to seek" I annex the whole passage *samajñāpayad āśu sarvān ānāyinas tadvichayé* (or *tad vichayé*) "he commanded therewith all fishermen to seek" that (bracelet," *valaya* masc neut) It may be considered as a point in favour of the view which regards *tad* as the accusative governed by *vichayé* that both the dative and accusative of abstracts formed by the suffix *a* occur as substitutes for the infinitive in construction with the accusative As regards the dative, I recall attention to *tvām paribhógāya*, "to enjoy thee," in the passage quoted above (p 1212 G ed.) An instance of the accusative of this class of words governing the accusative as substitute for the infinitive is afforded us in the Kṛiyâyôgasâia, of which we have to expect an edition from Wollheim *chakrē vṛvāhan tāt kanyām*, i e lit., "he made to marry that

* The commentary takes *tadvichayé* as compound, and explains *tad* by *tasyā 'bharanasya* I, however, do not doubt that *tad*, whether it be taken as the first member of a compound in the genitive relation, or as an accusative governed by *vichayé*, certainly refers to *valaya*, "bracelet," and not to *ābharana*, "ornament," which, in the preceding Ślōka, stands at the end of a Bahuvrīhi (*tulyapushpābharanah*)

maiden. Here we must return to the feminine form of the suffix $\text{यि} \text{ viz } \text{ā}$ isolated accusatives of which are employed in Zend for the infinitive where it expresses the accusative relation (see § 619). I now [G Ed p 1.10] prefer to translate the *varayām prachakramuh* mentioned at § 619 p 842 and which remains as yet a solitary example by 'they made to gain' than by 'they made gaining'*. To this form in *ām* may also be referred the Marāṭha infinitives in *un* e.g. कुरु *korun* 'to make to do' so that *u* would be to be taken as a corruption of an original *ā* as in the first persons as इच्छू *ichchhūn* 'I wish' (= Sanscrit *ichchhāmi*) कुरु *kōrun* 'I make' सक *sokun* 'I can' for which in Sanscrit we should expect according to the 1st class *karāmi sakāmi*. It appears to me however more probable that the said infinitives have lost a *t* just as in *bhāu* 'brother' for *bhrātā*. If this view be just still the Marāṭha infinitive cannot therefore be compared with the Sanscrit in *tum* because there is no reason apparent why the *u* should have been lengthened but I would rather explain कुरु *un* from कुरु *tun* for *tiam*, in the same way as *tiam* 'thou' in Marāṭha has become कुरु *tun*. In the Marāṭha infinitive therefore the suffix न्व *tvā* would be continued which in classical Sanscrit forms denominative abstracts (see § 834) and in the Vedic dialect also verbal abstracts (see § 835). From this suffix I should prefer also to deduce the Marāṭha gerund in कुरु *un*, thus e.g. कुरु *korun* 'after the making' ('having made') from the instrumental *kortvāna* † with the suppression of the final *a* which is left in the Prakrit gerunds as

* If *prachram* be not confirmed in the meaning 'to make' we must translate 'they began to obtain' which does not prejudice the infinitive nature of the form in *ām*.

† Cf. देवान् *dēvāno* or देवाने *dēvāne*, 'by the God' = Sanscrit *dēvān a*

[G. Ed p 1216] *pāūna, ghēūṇa, lahuūna, vilōhiūna, āgantūna, ghēttūna* The Prākṛit, however, is not wanting also in

The *t* of the gerundial suffix appears to be preserved principally, if not solely, under the protection of a preceding consonant. The first *t* of *ghēttūna* (Sanskrit root *grah*) evidently rests on assimilation, be it that the *n* or the *h* of *ghānh* (inf *ghānhudun* and *ghēttun*) has assimilated itself to the *t* following. In *hattūna*, from *han*, the first *t* stands decidedly for *n*. Lassen also (Inst p 367) compares these Prākṛit gerunds with those in Marāṭhī, but traces them both back to the above-mentioned (G. ed p 1207), but as yet unexplainable, gerund in *tvānam*. Against this explanation, even if the gerund in *tvānam* were better established than it is, as accusative, the objection would present itself, that the Prākṛit has nowhere else allowed the accusative sign *m* to be lost, but has everywhere retained it in the form of an anusvāna. Lassen (l c p 289) also deduces the Prākṛit nominal abstracts in *ttana* (by assimilation from *tvana*) from the already-mentioned *tvān*, but since then, in the edited Veda text an actual secondary (*taddhita*-) suffix *tvana* has been found, which, as such, as also by its form, has a much stronger claim to be regarded as the origin of the Prākṛit *ttana*. The following are examples *mahutvanā-m*, "greatness" (from the Vêdic *mah*, "great"), *śāhuvānā-m*, "friendship," *martyatvanā-m*, "mortality or humanity" (?). I cannot, however, see the reason why Benfey (Glossary to the Sâma-Vêda, s v *mahutva*) calls the suffix *tvana* more organic than *tva* for the broader form might as well be an extension of the shorter, as conversely the shorter be an abbreviation of the broader. They both appear to be of primitive antiquity. The former we have already recognised in Gothic and Slavonic (see §§ 834 835); on the latter is based very probably the Greek σύνη, *e g* in δουλοσύνη, δικαιοσύνη, σωφροσύνη, which has passed into the feminine. With regard to the syllable *sv*, for the Sanskrit *tva*, compare the relation of *śu* to *tva-m*, "thou" (§ 326). In Marāṭhī we meet with the Vêdic suffix *tvana* in the rather obscured form of *pōṇō* in abstract neuters, as, *bālōpōṇō*, "childhood" (see Vans Kennedy, "Dictionary," II p 16), with *p* for *tv* (cf § 341, Schluss and Hofer, "de Prâkrita dialecto," p 165). Carey (Gramm., p 32) writes पण् *pōṇ* for पण *pōṇō*, and suppresses also, in his dictionary, very frequently the final vowel of Sanskrit neuter bases in *a* he writes, *e g*, पाप् *pāp*, "sin," दशन् *dōṣōn*, "tooth," पायस् *pāyōs*, "milk," चंदन् *chōṇḍōn*, "sandal-wood," वाहन् *vahōn*, "vehiculum," for पाय *pāpō*, &c

gerunds which are based on the Sanscrit [G Ed p 1217] in *tvā*, as *e g gadua* = Sanscrit *gatā* with the final vowel shortened. The Marāthī also uses to express the infinitive abstract substantives in *ūñ* and indeed especially to express the nominative relation in which the form in *an* is scarcely to be found. Thus in Carey (Grammar p 76) *mōlā koronō padōto* to me to do (the doing) (is) beseeching on the other hand p 78, *min kōrun sokun* I can do p 80 *min korun ichchhun* I wish to do. We may here on account of the frequent and pervading interchange of *r* and *l* recall remembrance *en passant* to the remarkable similarity between the Marāthī dative accusative termination *lā* and the modern Persian *rā*. Compare for example the just mentioned *mōlā* 'to me me' with the Persian *merā*, and *tulā* 'to thee thee' with *turā*, *āmhlālā* (from *osmālā* see § 166) *ημῖν ημᾶς* with *mārā*, *tumhlālā* *υμῖν, υμας* with *shumārā*.

853 At the beginning of compounds the infinitive in *tim* according to the universal principle of the formation of compound words loses its case sign and then arises the bare theme in *tu*, *e g* Nal IX. 31 *nachā han tyaktu kamas tvām* nor also am I of the will to leave thee (having a quitting wish) where it is to be remarked, that in Sanscrit the first member of a compound may be treated in respect to syntax as an independent member of the sentence wherefore *tyaktu* here governs the accusative (*tvām*) just as much as if *tyaktum* stood there alone.

854 The Veda dialect generally employs the dative to express the causal relation of the dative and indeed either that above mentioned (§ 851) in *tavē* or [G Ed p 1218] *taiāi** from the proper infinitive base in *tu* or the dative

* The form in *taiāi* is the more rare it accents, beside the radical syllable also the case termination *e g yāmatai* "in order to bridle (Rigv I 28 4) *kārtavā*, "in order to make (Naigh II 1) In combination

of abstract radical words, or of an abstract feminine base terminating in *dhi* or *dhi'*, of which only the dative in *dhyáu* has been retained, so that this form has gained a still more genuine infinitive appearance through the lack of other cases from the same base. The termination *dhyáu* is always preceded by *a* or *aya*, by, therefore, the theme of the special tenses of the 1st or 6th class, with *a* as class-vowel, or by that of the 10th class, or causal form, with the character *aya*. Compare, *e g*, *píḃ-a-dhyáu* (strictly *píḃa-dhyáu*, cf. §. 503), "in order to drink" (Rígv. I 55 1), with *píḃati*, "he drinks," *ksháu-a-dhyáu*, "in order to flow" (I c 63 8), with *ksháu-a-ti*, *sáḥ-a-dhyáu*, "in order to conquer" (S V ed Benf, p 151), with *sáḥ-a-ti*, *vand-á-dhyáu*, "in order to praise," with the accusative, Rígv. I 61 5, *vîram*. *vandádhyáu*, "in order to praise the hero," with *vánd-a-té*, *cháu-á-dhyáu*, "in order to drink" (I c 61 72), with *cháu-a-ti*, *mád-ayá-dhyáu*, "in order to gladden or rejoice," with *mádáyati* (causal of the root *mad*, "to rejoice," Yajurv 3 13), *ísayadhyáu*, "in order to enjoy, to the enjoyment" (Rosen, "Rig-Vêdæ Specimen," p. 8), with *ís-ayati* *

[G Ed p 1219] The *ísadhyáu*, "in order to stride through," cited by Westergaard (Radices, p 278), belongs probably to the Vêdic *ís*, cl 6, and answers, therefore, to *ís-ú-ti*, "he goes" (Naigh II 14) Among the infinitives in *dhyáu*, the

combination with prepositions the first accent, and in other forms from the infinitive base in *tu* the only one falls on 'the preposition, *e g* *ánvētavái*, "in order to follow" (from *ánu* and *ētavái*, Rígv. I 24 8); *prátidhātavé*, "in order to place, to support" (from *práti*, "against," and *dhātavé*, I c)

* A denominative from *ís*, "wish, food," hence it signifies also "to wish" (so Rígv. I 77 4) I have already, in the "Journal for Lit Crit" (Dec 1830, p 949), explained the form *ísayadyáu*, which Sâyana regards as an instrumental plural, and explains by *ēshaníyáḥ*, as Rosen does by "*exoptatas*," as an infinitive, but I then found a difficulty in the *z*, in that I presupposed a verb of the 10th class, which would lead us to expect *ēshayadhyáu*. Cf Lassen, Anthol, p 133

form *īdīridh ā dhyāi* in order to make grow (Rigv I 61 3) stands hitherto quite isolated and may be regarded as a first attempt to form infinitives out of the themes of other tenses than the present or also as a remnant of a lingual period where perhaps from all or most of the tenses of the indicative infinitives in *dhyāi* might have been formed. Westergaard (Radices p 189) takes the said form as the infinitive of the perfect with which in form too it admirably corresponds as the root *īardh* (*īridh*) "to grow" also "to make to grow to augment to extend" in the Vedic dialect everywhere exhibits *īd* for *īa* in the syllable of reduplication. The fact of *īdīridh ā dhyāi* belonging according to its meaning which Śayanī explains by the causal infinitive *īardhayitum*, to the present cannot be impugned by its derivation from the perfect base as in the Vedas the participles also of the reduplicated preterite very often appear with a present signification e.g. Rigv I 89 * *tushturānsas laudantes*. The *ā* inserted in *īdīridh-ā dhyāi* is evidently the conjunctive vowel *ā* which belongs to the perfect and which in several places of the indicative has been weakened to *i* (see § 611) compare also with regard to the accentuation the dual forms *īdīridh ā tus* *īdīridh ā tus*. Just however as this *ā* of the indicative is referred by the Indian Grammarians to the personal terminations so Panini (III 1 2) regards the *ā* of the forms in *ā dhyāi* as really a mem. [G Ed p 120] ber of the formative suffix *. It may be left to further ex-

* Panini gives 1 c the suffix spoken of in six different forms viz *adhyāi adhyam īadhyāi kadhyāi sadhyāi sadīyāi*. The final *n* negatives the accentuation of the suffix (cf p 1202 G ed) and the initial *s* points out that the root appears in the form of the special tenses hence e.g. the above mentioned *pībadhyāi*, according to Sayana (ed Muller p 712) contains the suffix *sadīyāi* while *mādayādhyāi* since it has the accent on the *ā* which is reckoned to belong to the suffix according to Mahidhara contains the suffix *sadīyāi*. Compare the suffix *sa īc ā* according

amination of the usances of the Vêdic dialect, to decide whether we have not to assume also aorists of the infinitive in *dhyâti*, but with present signification, as in the potential (see § 705.). It is certain that when, as by Benfey (Glossary, p. 216), the potential forms like *huvéma*, *huvémahi*, *huvéya*, and the participles *huvát*, *huváná* (from the form *hu*, which is a contraction of *hvé*, "to call"), are ascribed to the aorist, we may with equal justice regard the infinitive *á-huvádhyái*, "to invoke" (Yajur. 3 13), as the aorist. For the present I prefer, however, to assume that the form *hu*, which is contracted from *hvé*, is, in the Vêda dialect, inflected according to three different classes, and refer the said potential forms to the 6th class, the participles *huvát*, *huváná*, and the plural middle *huvámahi* (the latter with irregular lengthening of the *u*), to the 2d, [G Ed p 1221] and forms like *huváté*, "he calls," to the

according to Wilson ('Introduction to the Grammar of the Sanscrit Language,' 2d Ed, p. 327), by which adjectives like *piba*, "drinking;" *pa'yá*, "seeing," *páraya*, "filling." By *h* is pointed out the pure, devoid of Guna or weakened form of the verbal theme, and hence *e g*, to the form *áhuvádhyái*, "to invoke" (Yajur. 3 13), from the form *hu*, which is contracted from *hvé*, is the suffix *adhyaú* assigned. *Adhyai*, or, without accent, *adhyaín*, is the suffix when it is appended to the form of the root strengthened or incapable of the Guna-increment, *e g* in *kshuadhyaú* (Rigv. I 63 8), "in order to flow," from the root *kshai*, Cl 1.

* I believe I may venture to trace back to *hu*, Cl 1, the Zend *du*, 'to speak,' which as yet has not been satisfactorily compared with the Sanscrit (see Burnouf, *Études*, p. 309), while another *du*, which signifies "to run," evinces unmistakeably its affinity with the Sanscrit roots of motion *dhu*, *dhū*, and *dhāv* (the latter likewise "to run"). I look upon the transition of *h* to *g d* in this light, viz that the former has first become *g d*, and thence *d*, since of the *dh* sound only the first element remains. In the former respect, compare the relation of *g d g d* *jan*, "to slay," to the Sanscrit *हन्* *han*, in the latter, that of the Old Persian *adam*, "I," to *अहम्* *ahám*, and of the New Persian *dest*, "hand," to *دست* *hásta*, *dānem*, "I know," to *دانانم* *jānāmi*.

1st The 1st person singular *hure* which occurs at the end of the Sloka quoted might as well be referred to the 2d as to the 6th class and just so the active participle *hurat* I prefer however to assign the latter to the 2d rather than to the 6th class because ns participle of the 2d class it answers to the middle participle *hundna*. Then *ā huradhyāi gamadhyāi* to go (Yajur VI 3) would have greater claim to be regarded as the infinitive of the aorist (*agamam*) as *gam* in the special tenses substitutes *gacih*, if, however the hitherto unrecalled form *gameti* which Yaska (Naigh II 11) assigns to the Veda dialect be established then *gamadhyāi* too may hold good as the infinitive of the present. It would be a convincing proof of the existence of an infinitive of the aorist could we anywhere point out the form *rochadhyai* (cf § 55)

§ 55. As infinitives of the third formation of the aorist (not however of the form in *dhyāi*) may be regarded the forms mentioned by Panini (III 1 10) *rōhishyāi* and *vyathishyāi* (the latter with *a* privative) "The root *ruh* to grow," would according to the third formation of the aorist form *ārōhisham*, and from *vyath* middle "to tremble" is really to be found the aorist *āvyathishi*. After deducting the augment and the personal termination there [G Pd p 12²] remain *rōhish* *vyathish* as temporal bases whence through the feminine form *i* of the suffix *a* might easily arise as abstracts *rōhishi* *vyathishi* the datives of which must be *rōhishyāi* *vyathishyāi*. These datives might also be derived from feminine bases in short *i* which therefore would be appended to the aorist theme *rōhish* *vyathish* in the same way as e.g. that of *ranhi* quickness to the primitive root *ranh*. In this case instead of *āi* we might expect also *ay i* in the dative. But if the said infinitives really belong to the third formation of the aorist then those in *sē* with the general dative termination *ē* may be referred to the 2d (Greek 1st) (see § 555) where we should have to

assume that the conjunctive vowel, which enters between the appended verb substantive and the personal termination, does not extend itself to infinitives like *vakshê*, "to drive," *jshê*, "to conquer." The first example occurs in the Schol. to Pân, III 4 9, the latter Rîgv. I 112 12, *anaśvân yâbhê râtham âvatam jîśê*, "by which ye help the courserless chariot to conquer" ("on account of conquering"). Sâyana calls the termination of this infinitive form *ksê*, because the radical vowel has no Guna. The gunised infinitives in *sê* (euphon *shê*, on account of the preceding *v, â, k*), like the 1 c. adduced *mêshê*, "to east, to east down" (root *m*), answer better to the 1st aorist formation, viz to the middle of roots ending in a vowel, which reduce the Vriddhi augment of their active, on account of the too great weight of the middle terminations, to that of Guna, while the roots ending in a consonant renounce all increase to the vowel in the middle. We might therefore refer all

[G Ed p 1223] infinitives in *sê*, whether with Guna or not, to the 1st aorist formation. But whether the infinitives in *sê* are to be considered as formed from the 1st or 2d aorist, their agreement is remarkable with that of the 1st aorist in Greek, as, *λῦ-σαι*, *τύπ-σαι*, *δῦ-σαι*, for which, in Sanscrit, if *lû*, "to cut off," *tup*, "to smite, to wound," *dûs* (from *dik*), "to shew," had formed an infinitive of this kind, we should have expected *lû-shê*, *tup-shê*, *dik-shê* to *θῦσαι* would correspond *bhû-shê*, where we may recall attention to the fact, that the Vêda dialect has in the imperative also retained aorists of this kind, and, indeed, from the root *bhû*, the forms *bhû-sha* = *φῦσον*, *bhû-shatam* (*upa-bhûshatam*) = *φύσασθον*, without our being able to trace the analogous indicative form

* The grammatical technical language decides, with respect to the accent and the stronger or weaker form of the root, according to Pân 1 c *sê*, *sên*, and *ksê*

836 The Vedic infinitives in *se* and their analogous Greek forms in *σαι* conduct us to the Latin in *re* which in the Annals of Oriental Literature p 58 I have already endeavoured to compare with the Greek infinitives of the 1st aorist. It is certain that in the Latin infinitives in *re* (from *se*) just as in the Greek 1st aorist and the four first formations of the Sanskrit aorist the verb substantive is contained. This is clearly seen in *pos se* (for *pot se*) as *possum* throughout its conjugation exhibits the combination of *pot* (by assimilation *pos*) with the verb substantive (regarding *pot ui* from *pot fui* see § 559). *Is se* for *ed se* (with *ed e-re*) most accurately corresponds with the said Sanskrit infinitives, and if in the Vedas an infinitive of this kind should occur from the root *ad* it must in accordance with the well known law of sound be no other than *at se*. In *fer re* from *fer se* and *tel le* from *tel se* the sibilant of the auxiliary verb has become assimilated to the preceding consonant. For *fer re* we should have expected in the Veda dialect *bhri shé* or *bhar shé*. To the Latin infinitives *da re stá-re í-re* would in Vedic Sanskrit, [G Pd p 1224] correspond *dá se sthá se** : *shé* (according to the analogy of *ju shé*) † or *é shé* (after the analogy of *mé shé*). Observe that only those Latin verbs which absolutely or in some persons by the direct annexation of the personal terminations to the root are based on the root of the Sanskrit 2d class (see § 109 3) may or must also annex this suffix of the infinitive directly while all others retain the class vowel and indeed in the third conjugation *e* (for *i* from *a*) on account of the following *r* (see § 707) hence *tel e re* corresponds to the above mentioned Sanskrit *ak shé* (euphonic

* If not *sthi shé* with the *á* weakened to *i* as in *sthi té* (p 1118 Note *) and in *sthi ti* (§ 844)

† In the Schol. to Pan 1 c we actually find *préshé* as compounded of *pra ishé*

for *vah-sé*). Perhaps, also, we ought to look upon the *a* of the infinitives mentioned by Pāṇini (III. 4 १) in *asé* as the class-vowel, and so the often-occurring *jñ-á-sí*,[†] “in order to live” (cf. *jñv-a-ti*, “he lives”) would answer to the Latin *viv-e-re*. Another example of this kind is *viñjásé*, “in order to adorn,” which, in a passage cited by Benfey (Glossary, p. 34) of the 5th book of the Rígv, runs parallel to the dative *stótaré* of the common infinitive *vémí tíá píshann viñjásé vémí stótaré*, “I come, O Píshann, thee to glorify! I come (thee) to praise!” Thus, Rígv I. 112 ३, *cháksasé* stands beside the dative of the common infinitive [G. Ed p 1225] *tive étavé* “by which deeds ye enable the blind (Rívráshvas) to see, the Śrónas to go”

857 We cannot overlook the possibility that the *a* of the Sanscrit infinitives in *asé* might also be the radical vowel of the verb substantive, though the latter is lost in compounds, and in many simple formations (see § 450). Then *-asé* would correspond to the Latin *esse*, inasmuch as *esse* is not to be divided into *es-se*; and here, therefore, the root of “to be” would occur twice, which we have admitted as possible above, in the subjunctive *essem*.[‡] Be that, however, as it may, the forms in *asé* and *sé*, if they really contain the verb substantive, accord, as regards the principle of formation of the final infinitive expression, with the simple infinitives, which exhibit the dative of bare radical words, as, *drísé*, “in order to see.” These always express a genuine dative relation, as, e g, Rígv. I 23 21, *súryan drísé*, “in order to see the sun,” 13 7., *idán ná bahír áśádé*, “in order to repose on this our straw,”

* Cf e g *pat-a-tra-m* (p 1108 2 5), *ára-ti-s*, “fear” (§ 847)

† E g Rígv I 37 15, where it governs the accusative “We are to them (belonging or devoted to Maruts), in order to live the whole life (life’s duration)” (*viśvañ chid áyur jivásé*)

‡ See § 708, and Curtius “Contributions,” p 352

10० is *atikramē* to step beyond to slight The last named passage deserves especial notice since here the dative of the infinitive appears to hold the place of the nominative of a future passive participle exactly in the same way as we use for the same end the infinitive with the preposition *zu* in such sentences as *er ist zu loben* (*laudandus est*) i.e. he is fitted for praise Moreover in the said passage in the Sanskrit text the substantive verb is in spirit present but as is very common not formally expressed I annex Wilson's translation The sun who is avowedly made the path in heaven is not to be disregarded, Gods (by you) * Perhaps the Latin also was [G Ed p 120^c] not wanting in infinitives which correspond to the Vedic like *drishē ā sadē atī lramē* they would be to be looked for in the 3d conjugation where by the side of passive infinitives like *dici* (older form *dici er*) must stand active forms like *dice* in case the passive infinitive terminations *i er* are not abbreviations of *eri erier*, for from *dicere* must have come *diceri dicerier* as *amari amurier moneri monerier audiri audirier* from *amare* &c As regards the origin of the Latin passive infinitives the form in *i* is evi-

— — —

* *Asānyāh pānthā adityō dūḥ pravachyan kṛitah | nā sū dēḥ ī atikramē*
 Pāṇini in constructions of this kind appears really to regard the infinitive datives in *i* with those in *taras* (see § 351 p 116.) as Vedic representatives of the future passive participles in *ya taraya* and *anyā* (called in the technical language of grammar *ī ritya*) for (III 4 11) he puts them on the same footing with two real participial suffixes capable of declension when he says that the suffixes *taras* & *anya* and *tā* in the Vēdas are used in the senso of *kṛitya* In the following Sūtra *machal shē* (root *chakṣh*, prep *ā*) is expressly represented as a participle of this kind and in the Commentary he explains *nā machalshē* by *na vakhyātavyam non narrandum* In the passage referred to above Sūrya regards the form under discussion as a future passive participle since his phrases *nā tī lramē* by *nā tī kramitun sakyaḥ* and cites Pāṇini's Sūtra here quote!



dently an abbreviation of the older *z-er* (*laudauer, uiderer, credier*, see p 662). The transition of the active *le* into *ri* before the appended *er* of the passive can scarcely arise in aught else than in the avoidance of the cacophony which would be occasioned by two successive *e* in forms like *laudareer*. We cannot be surprised that the *e* of the active infinitive termination is short, when, as the representative of the Sanscrit and Greek diphthong *se, σαι*, it ought to be long, as vowels at the end of a word are, for the most part,

[G Ed p. 1227] subject to abbreviation, or to entire suppression,* The length of the *i* of the passive infinitive may be regarded as a compensation for the *er* that has been dropped.†

* Observe, *e g*, the short final *e* in *benē, malē*, while in adverbs from adjectives of the 2d declension a long *ē* is found, in which I believe I recognise the Sanscrit diphthong *é* (= *a+i*) of the locative of bases in *a* (= Latin *u* of the 2d declension). Compare, *e g*, *noīē* with the Sanscrit locative *naīē*, from the base *naia*, "new". Observe, also, the occasional shortening of the *ē* of some imperatives of the 2d conjugation (*care*, &c), and the regular abbreviation of the *ē* of Old High German conjunctives at the word's end, as, *būe*, "he may carry" = Sanscrit *bhārēt*, Gothic *bunar* (§ 694 p 922).

† I should not wish to have recourse to the rule which is set forth in the prosody of Latin grammars, that *i* at the end of a word, exclusive of certain well-known exceptions, is long, since in all cases in which, in Latin, the final *i* is long, there is a reason for it at hand, *e g* in the genitive singular and nominative plural of the 2d declension (see pp 215, 244). I now refer the dative termination *i* rather to the real dative termination in Sanscrit *ī* (= *ai*), than to the locative termination *i*, as in the plural also the termination *bus* evidently answers to the Sanscrit dative ablative ending, while in Greek the dative singular and plural equally well admit of being compared with the Sanscrit locative (see §§ 195 251.) The length of the *i* of *tibi* (*ibi, ubi*), *mihī*, contrasted with the Sanscrit datives *túbhyām, máhyām* (§ 215), may be looked upon as compensation for dropping the personal termination *am* without this loss, from *bhyam, hyam*, we should find in Latin *brum, hrum*. In the 1st person singular of the perfect, the length of the *i* may be looked upon as compensation

§58 It remains for us to mention the infinitive of the Latin perfect. Here we see in such forms as *amavi se* *monui se* *legi se* *audiui se* the infinitive of the verb substantive as plainly as in the pluperfects like *amaveram* we discover the imperfect with the loss thereof—[G E1 p 123] before of the vowel of the auxiliary verb which I assume in *amave ram* also (see § 614). But if the said perfect infinitives are just as the pluperfects evidently modern formations still forms like *scrip se* *consum se* *admis se* *divis se* *dic-se* *produc se* *abstrac se* *adlec se* (see Struve On the Latin Declension and Conjugation p 178) which are of frequent occurrence in the older dialect have every claim to be regarded as transmitted from an ancient period of language and to be placed beside Greek aorist infinitives and indeed with so much the more right as all the Latin perfects are very probably in their origin nothing else than aorists (see § 546). We may consequently compare *scrip se* *dic se* with the Greek *ῥαπ-σαι* *δεικ-σαι* and *αλlec-se* with the Sanscrit *lak shé* mentioned above (p 1222 G ed). It is here important to remark that for all the perfect infinitives of the 3d conjugation quoted by Struve &c there are also analogous perfects (aorists) of the indicative as points of departure just as there are for the Greek infinitives in *σαι* (*ξαι ψαι*) indicatives in *σα* (*ξα ψα*), only *inas se* *divis se* (by assimilation from *inad se* *divid se* cf § 101) are more perfectly preserved than *intu si* *divi si* which have lost the final consonant of the root in compensation for which in *divi si* the

compensation for dropping the personal termination (see § 552 Conclusion) in the 2d person the *i* of the termination *si* represents if the explanation given in § 549 be correct the long *i* of the Sanscrit ending *thas*. In a similar way the *u* of *uti* is based as I now assume in departure from § 42 on the long *u* of Sanscrit pronominal adverbs in *tha* e.g. *uti* corresponds to the Vedic *īa tha* how? (Pan V 3 3)

short radical vowel is lengthened The future perfects* like *faro*, *capso*, *aro*, *accepso*,† which in appearance are analogous to the infinitives in *se*, as also the perfect and pluperfect

[G Ed. p 1229] subjunctives, as *arim*, *ausim*, *objerim*, *excessis*, *dixis*, *induris*, *traris*, *sponsis*, *amissis*, *injerit*, *erlinxit*, *ademsit*, *serpsit*, *incensit*, *faxem*, *erlinxem*, *intelleres*, *recesset*, *viret*, *traret* (see Struve, l. c., p 175), can hardly be put on the same footing with the infinitives in *se*, first, because the least of these have an indicative perfect in *si* (*si* = *e-si*) corresponding to them, and secondly, because, even if this were the case, still, e g *capso*, *arim*, *erlinxem*, could not, perhaps, have been derived from the to-be-presupposed *capsi*, *ari*, and the actually existing *erlinxi*, by the termination of the future perfect and of the perfect and pluperfect subjunctive being substituted for the terminations of the perfect The said three tenses and moods are comparatively modern formations, and are formed by combining the future and the present and imperfect subjunctive of the verb substantive with the perfect base‡ of the attributive verb, and the affinity of their concluding portion with the *si* of perfects like *serp-si* consists, consequently, not only in this, that in the latter also the verb substantive is contained, but in primeval relationship, which extends beyond the time of the separation of languages, if I am right in identifying such perfects with the Sanscrit 2d and Greek 1st aorist formations (see § 551) We gain, therefore, nothing towards the explanation of the forms under dis-

* In departure from what has been remarked at § 664, I now regard *faro*, and similar forms, as real future perfects

† The *e* for *i* in *accepso*, and similar forms, is based on the principle laid down in § 6, whence *accepso*, *objerim*, like *acceptus*, *abjectus*, for *accipetus*, *abjictus*

‡ *Amave-ro* from *amavi-ero*; cf § 644, *amave-um* from *amavi-sim*, according to § 710, *amavi-ssem* from *amavi-sssem*

cussion unless we presuppose non existing perfects like *an fari sponsi*, for we must then first put aside the auxiliary verb of the perfect indicative in order to replace it with the auxiliary of the new formation here spoken of (so *sim s m*) or we cannot explain *e g fairo* from the to be presupposed *fari* by means of the hence theoretically to be formed *fairo* by presupposing *un* [G Ed p 12^{oa}] overspringing of the letters *er*. Why is it however that we do not occasionally find together with the really existing future perfects contractions of this kind? Why do we not for instance find together with *fierro n fite*, with *expero c'po*, with *teligero n teligo*? Or must *e g fac so* have been formed from a to-be presupposed *facero* in such wise that the *r* formed from *s* has again returned to its original state and been joined directly to the final consonant of the root after the *e* has been rejected? Or was *fairo* formed from *facero* at a time when *s* between two vowels did not regularly become *r* (see § 22)? I should now prefer deriving the obsolete future perfects and the perfect and pluperfect conjunctives in *um sem* connected with these from a lost stock of real perfects since the existing preterites called perfects of all gradations are originally norists. There might *e g* have existed together with the norists *fai c'pi* (see § 519) *duc si duc-si sponondi* (see § 519) perfects like *fifaca* (or *pfaca*) *cecapa* * *didica duduca spononda* which we might well assign to the Latin in an earlier period of the language at the time of its close connection with the Greek. It may remain undecided whether the Latin afterwards dropped the syllable of reduplication

* The existing law according to which the heaviest vowel *a* is in consequence of the incumbrance of the reduplication weakened to *i* (see §§ 6 570) must have had its beginning and may not perhaps, have obtained in a time to which we are here endeavouring to look back. Observe that the Oscan *fefacust* is in sense = *fecerat*

[G Ed p 1231] at once in the perfect indicative,* as it laid aside the augment in the imperfect and aorist† or whether this renunciation first took place when the verb was encumbered with the addition of the auxiliary verb substantive, just as the reduplicated aorists (perfects) in composition with prepositions for the most part dispense with the syllable of reduplication,‡ while the analogous Sanscrit reduplicated aorists (as *ádudruvam*) throughout retain it in composition also. Be that, however, as it may, at some time or other reduplicated future perfects, too, will have existed, thus, *e g fefaxo* (or *pefaro*), *cecapso*, which, in essentials, would correspond to the Greek future perfects, as, *ἁλύ-σομαι*, *τετύπ-σο-μαι*, to which will have originally corresponded also active future perfects, as, *ἁλύ-σω*, *τετύπ-σω*, whose offshoots they properly are. Should this not be the case, we have nothing left but to abide by the opinion expressed above (§ 664), and still earlier in my "Conjugation-System" (p. 98), viz that, as is also assumed by Madvig,† the future perfects under discussion are formally, as also partly as regards their meaning, primary futures. In fact, *axo* is as like the Greek *ἄξω* as one egg to another. Madvig fitly compares forms like *levasso* with those in Greek like *γέλασω*. The doubling of the *s* would consequently be purely phonetic, without etymological meaning, as, *e g* in the Greek *ἐγέλασσα*, mentioned by Madvig, and like *ἐτέλεσσα*, mentioned with a similar object above (§ 708).

* Then, perhaps, *faca*, *capa*, *sponda*, would have the same relation to *fefaca*, or *pefaca*, &c, as, in Gothic, *e g band* to the Sanscrit *babandha* (see § 589), and those preterites which have still retained the reduplication in Gothic, as, *e g gaigrót*, "I, he wept" = Sanscrit *chakránda*.

† It is probably to the weak form of the roots, and then terminating in a vowel, that *do* and *sto* owe the pervading retention of the reduplication in composition.

‡ "De formarum quarundam verbi Latini naturâ et usu" (Solemnia academica etc, Hauniæ, 1835, p 6

Moreover if *lelasso* be regarded as an abbreviation of *lelelasso* and as an actual future it cor [G Ed p 1232] responds in respect to its denoting the future relation to *γελασω* just as exclusive of the passive personal termination to the Greek future perfect like *τετιμησομαι*. This opinion is especially favoured by the old infinitives in *ssere* (Struve p 180) with the signification of the primary future *impetrassere reconciliassere expugnassere averuncassere depulcassere deargentassere*. They correspond irrespective of the infinitive suffix which throughout in Latin is that of the 1st and of the doubling of the *s* which cannot surprise us to the Greek future infinitives like *γελασειν*. We might reasonably expect that such infinitives not only originally existed in the 1st conjugation but that there were such forms also as *habessere axere* (= ἄξειν) *faxere capere*. It may be proper here to consider also the future perfects of the Oscan and Umbrian languages as both these dialects in several other grammatical points present us with older forms than the Latin. It is important here to notice that the Umbrian in most of the future perfects which have remained to our time exhibits the combination of the future perfect of the verb substantive with the present base or the simple root of the principal verb but in such wise that after consonants and also in one instance given by Aufrecht and Kirchhof (Umbrian Language p 146) after a vowel (*i ust werit*) the *f* of the root *fu* is rejected hence e.g. *fak-ust* signifying he is making to have been while the Latin *fecerit* means he is having made to be. Other examples are *covort ust converterit* *ampr e fus ambuerit* (cf *fus* also *fust fuerit*) *ambr e furent ambuerint* (cf *furent fuerint*) *fak urent fecerint*. The Oscan follows the same principle only it is wanting as to the perfect retention of *fu* but also in the simple u e.g. in *dikust dixerit pruhubust prohi-* [G Ed p 1233] *buerit fefakust fecerit* Mommsen (Oscan Studies p 62)

has recognised the root *fu* before the light was thrown upon it by the Umbrian. As the root *fu* in the conjugation of the verb substantive regularly makes its appearance in the perfect tense first, it has hence won for itself the capacity of expressing the relation of past time, which, however, is no obstacle to the "*fust*" in Oscan signifying also "*erit*" (see Mommsen, l c. p 61), the latter being in excellent agreement with the Zendian *𐬔𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬀* *būsyēti*, and Lithuanian *bus* (see p 918 G. ed). Wherefore, also, *sfakust* may be literally taken to mean, "he is having made to be," since here the principal verb expresses past time by reduplication the like may be the case with some reduplicated future perfects in the Umbrian (l c. p 146).

859 We return to the infinitive, in order to remark next, that, in the Vêdic dialect also, accusatives of abstract radical words are used as infinitives, and, indeed, in the genuine accusative relation, only, however, where the infinitive is governed by *śak*, "to be able." According to Pāṇini (III 4. 12) they are divided into two classes, of which the one strengthens the radical vowel, the other leaves it without extension. The Commentary furnishes as examples, *agnin vāi dēvā vibhājan* (an euphonic for *am*) *nā 'śaknuvan*, "the fire could the gods not distribute," *apalupan(-am) nā 'śaknuvan*, "they could not destroy." To these we add, also, out of the Rigvêda (I 94 3), *śakēma* [G Ed p 1234] *tvā samīdham*, "would that we could kindle thee," and a passage from the Atharva-Vêda, cited by Aufrecht ("Umbrian Language," p 118), *mā śakan pratidhām iśum*, "they cannot dispose the arrow." Though these infinitives may scarcely have been limited originally

* In this passage, which is detached from the context, I cannot answer for the exact meaning of *vibhājam*. As regards the lengthening of the vowel of the root *bhāj* in this infinitive form, compare the feminine substantive *bhāj*, "portion, fortune, homage"

to the construction with *sal* yet it is probable they can never have had a very extensive use since in general the bare radical words are the most rare kind of abstract substantives. I therefore prefer comparing the Oscan and Umbrian infinitives in *um* (which Aufrecht and Kirchhof refer to this class) with the very numerous class of abstract substantives which are formed by the suffix *α*, and which as has been shewn are also occasionally substituted for infinitives and to the accusatives of which the Umbrian Oscan infinitives correspond better as regards form than to those of bare radical words as bases ending in a consonant especially the words of the 3d declension in Oscan terminate in the accusative in *m* and in Umbrian after the analogy of the Greek have lost the nasal of the termination and end in the masculine or feminine with *u* or *o*. On the other hand the accusatives of the 2d declension which are based on the Sanscrit class of words in *a* end universally in Oscan in *um* or *om* and in Umbrian the nasal of the termination *um* or *om* is frequently suppressed (Aufr. and Kirchh., p. 116) and just so in the infinitive *e.g.* *asferu* and *asfero* *circumferre* *erum* and *ero esse*. The following are examples of Oscan infinitives *deikum dicere*, *alum agere* *moltuum multare* * The last example is that which most resists identification with the accusatives of the Sanscrit radical words and one sees plainly that here the *u* is a formative suf- [C. Fd. p. 123.] fix which has been added to the theme of the 1st conjugation. As this corresponds to the Sanscrit 10th class (see § 109 c) we may compare *moll d am* exclusive of the masculine termination opposed to the Sanscrit Zendian feminine one with the Sanscrit and Zend infinitives mentioned above (§ 619) like *चरयाम चोरयाम* *चरयाम* *राद्ध*

* Mommsen l. c. p. 66. These forms are distinguished from the common accusatives of the 2d declension only by the unmarked *u*.

ay-um. Especial notice ought to be given to the form *trubarakavum*, if it, as Mommsen conjectures, is really a perfect infinitive, in which case *v-um*, euphonic for *u-um*, from *fu-um*, is the infinitive of the root *fu* with past signification (cf p 1232 G ed. *dik-ust*, “*dixerit*,” from *dik-fust*) Curtius* has compared with the Oscan present infinitives in *um* the Latin *venum* | If this comparison be, as I think it is, correct, then this word, of which only the dative (*veno*, *venui*) and ablative *veno* are preserved, may originally belong only to the 2d declension moreover, the *u* of the 4th declension, as formative suffix of an abstract in Latin, would stand quite isolated, while that of the 2d is frequently represented by the Sanscrit suffix *a* as a means of formation of masculine abstracts These, for the most part, accent the radical vowel, and Gunaise it when capable of Guna, while a radical *a* before a simple consonant is lengthened. The following are examples, in addition to those already mentioned *bhédā-s*, “cleaving” (root *bhid*), *chhédā-s*, id (root *chhid*), *yóga-s*, “combining” (root *yuy*), *kródhā-s*, “anger” (root *krudh*), *hása-s*, “laughter” (root *has*), *káma-s*, “wish, love” (root *kam*) In Greek, abstracts like *πάλο-s*, *φόβο-s*, *δρόμο-s*, *βρόμο-s*, *τρόμο-s*, *φόνο-s*, *πλό(F)ο-s*, [G Ed p 1236] *πόνο-s*,† *ἐλεγχο-s*, *ἡμερο-s*, correspond both in the suffix and in the accent The Lithuanian, on account of the retention of the original *a* in abstracts of this kind, resembles the Sanscrit more than the Greek and Latin, which latter, with the exception at least of the base *venu*, already spoken of,

* “Journal of Archæology,” June 1847, p 490

† *Venundo*, properly, “I give to sell,” *venco*, for *venum eo*, “I go to the selling”

‡ As *o* is a heavier vowel than *ε*, the choice of this vowel in place of the *ε*, which elsewhere prevails in the roots referred to, reminds us of the vowel increment which appears in the corresponding Sanscrit abstracts, although *o*, as also *ε*, is only a corruption of an original *a* (see § 3 p 4, and cf § 255 a)

presents for comparison only *ludu s* and perhaps *jocu s* (the latter from an obscure root) The following are examples in Lithuanian *miega-s* sleep (*mėgmi* I sleep) *uz-mata s* reproof accusation * (*metu* I cast) *bada s* hunger (*bādu* I hunger cf Sanscrit *bādḥ* or *vadh* to vex) *juka s* laughter (cf Latin *jocu s*) *kāra s* strife war, *mena s* understanding (*menu* I think *meno-s* I am skilful in something) *maina s* exchange *ieda s* order regulation *rotla s* advice

860 To this class in the Old Slavonic belong those masculine abstracts of which Dobrowsky says (p 267) that they contain the pure radical syllable they contain however in fact the suffix *o* corrupted from *a* (see §§ 255 a 257) which in the nominative and accusative is suppressed or more correctly replaced by *ъ* which Dobrowsky does not write The following are examples *ловъ lov* the seizing (Sanskrit *lābha s* obtaining) *токъ tok* the flowing (*текъ tekun* I run) *бродъ brod* passage forth *исходъ isxod* exit *гладъ glad* [G Ed p 1237] 'hunger † *стыдъ stud* shame *страдъ strad* fear, from the bases *lovo tolo* &c Observe the agreement evinced by the Slavonic with the Greek in the choice of the stronger radical vowel so that *егъ rokh tok* has exactly the same relation to *tekun* I run that in Greek *δρομος* has to *δρεμω*, *φοβος* to *φεβομαι* &c The relation of *стыдъ-stud* shame to *стыдъ styd* in *стыдѣти ѣм styd yeti san* to be ashamed (see Michlos Rad p 88) resembles that of Sanscrit abstracts like *yoga s* joining to their

* This word deserves notice on account of the retention of the old *a* which in the verb and most of the other formations of this root has been corrupted to *e* *Metu* I cast * *uz-mata s*, reproof, *at-mota s* 'out cast (also *at-mata s*), bear the same relation to one another as *e g* in Greek *τρεπω τραπεων τροπος*

† Sanscrit *gradh* to crave from *gardh* or *gradh* Gothic *gredon* to hunger see Glossarium Sanscr (Fa c I a 1840) p 107

roots with *u*, for *oy ū* is in Slavonic the Guna of *u y* (see § 255 f.)

861. In German, too, the masculine abstracts which belong to this class have, by suppressing the final vowel of the base in the nominative and accusative, acquired the semblance of radical words. As, however, the bases in *a* and *i* are not distinguishable in the singular, it remains uncertain whether *e g* the Gothic *thlauh-s*, "flight," stands for *thlauha-s*, or for *thlauhi-s* (see § 135) in the former case it answers to the Sanscrit formations like *yóga-s*, "combination," but

The root of the said Gothic abstract is *thluh*, whence *thluha*, *thlauh*, *thlauhum*, the latter euphonic for *thluhum* (see § 82). The fact, that *thlauh-s* corresponds, as regards its vowel, better to the preterite than to the present, must not induce us to derive it from the preterite instead of from the root otherwise we should have almost as much ground for deriving *e g* the Sanscrit *yóga-s* from *yuyóga* ("I or he joined"), *bhédā-s*, "rupture," from *bibhédā*, and, in Greek, *δρόμο-s* from *δέδρωμα*. The truth is, that, in the formation of words, reconise is had sometimes to the pure, sometimes to the incremental radical vowel, and, moreover, in Greek and German, at times to the original radical vowel, at times to it in a form more or less weakened. Had, in Greek, *δράμος* been said for *δρόμος*, still the abstract would not have been to be derived from the aorist (*ἔδραμον*), but it would have had only this advantage in common with the latter, the retention, namely, of the radical vowel in its original form, while the *e* of *δρέμω* is the greater, and the *o* of *δέδρωμα* the lesser weakening of the old *a*. In Gothic, *u* is the least (see § 490) and *i* the extreme weakening of the *a*, wherefore *run(a)-s*, "course, stream," from the root *ram*, "to run, to flow" (*rīma*, *rann*, *runmun*), stands on the footing of Greek abstracts like *δρόμο-s* so far, in reality, the said Gothic word belongs to the *a*-declension. We can, however, on account of the form of its radical vowel, just as little derive it from the plural of the preterite, as we could derive *e g* *anaflh*, "delivery" (neut.) from the same, because it exhibits the vowel of the present instead of that of the root itself (*falh*). Neither, too, can we derive *drus*, "fall," for *drusa-s* or *drusi-s* (the nominative sign is dropped in bases in *sa* and *si*), from the plural of the preterite, but, like the latter, it contains the pure radical vowel, which, in the present *drusa*, is Gunised by *i* (see § 27), and, in the singular preterite *draus*, by *a*. That the class of words under discussion is not wanting in Zend also is proved by

86 To return to the Sanscrit infinitive suffix *tu* it is further to be remarked that the forms which are contracted by means of it occur in the Vedas also in the ablative and genitive which two cases are not formally distinguished from one another. Their use however is rare and the ablative appears in the examples mentioned and in the Schol to Pan III 4 16 quite in the character of a common abstract substantive and we might *e g* regard the Latin *ortus* everywhere that it occurs as an infinitive equally as well as the ablative *ad lltos* go [G Ed p 1239] governed l e by *purā* ere earlier before (*purā sūryasyā detoh* (*ya ud*) before the rising of the sun) In the other examples too given l e the ablative of the abstract in *tu* is governed by a preposition and indeed either by *purā* before or by *a* to so also in a passage of the 1st book of the R̥gveda (41 9) which has been already pointed out by Bohtlingk (Commentary on Pan, p 152) *ā nīdhātōh* to the casting (the dice) Panini however limits the kind of infinitive under discussion to the roots *sīhu kar* (*kar*) *vad char hu tam* and *jan* and therefore it is probably that Sayana sees in *nī dhātōh* no so called *tōsun* but a common abstract with the suffix *tu n* (cf p 1220 Note G ed) Perhaps too *nī dhātu* has a perfect declension and thereby in the opinion of the Indian

by the bases *ṣṛṣṭya* *zaosha*, wish will (Sanskrit root *jush* to love to wish'), *ṣṛṣṭā* *frasa*, query *ṣṛṣṭā* *na* 'destruction' (see p 995 G ed, § 724) *ṣṛṣṭā* *fra lala* announcement *ṣṛṣṭā* *ra dha* growth *ṣṛṣṭā* *maga* greatness (growth see Burnouf Yaçna p 72)

Grammarians, divides itself from the infinitive and its Vêdic representatives.

563 The form in *tôs*, according to Pânini (who nevertheless does not regard it as a genitive, but as an indeclinable (I 1 40), as in the gerund in *tvâ*, and in the genitive of abstract radical words, where it stands for the infinitive^{*}) occurs only in construction with *śvara*, "loird, capable" (III 4 13). The Scholiast gives as example, *śvarâḥ bhūcharitôḥ*, "capable of affronting (loird of affronting)" Another genitive of this kind, though not recognised as an infinitive, and also not limited to the construction with *śvara*, is *kāntôs*, "of the doing, making, transacting," which Naigh., II 1, mentions with the infinitive dative *kāntavân*, and the gerund *kṛtvā* (see p 1205, G. ed), under the words signifying *karman* ("deed"), and which, Rîgv I. 115 4, is governed by *madhyâ*, "in the midst" | As regards the relation of the gerund

* The genitive termination *as* is looked upon by the Indian Grammarians in this case, not as a case-termination, but as a formative suffix, which is called in the technical language *k-as-un* (cf p 1220, Note, G ed), and is therefore unaccented, though, in general, the monosyllabic base words have the accent only in the strong casts on the base syllable (see p 1085, G ed, § 785 Remark) We may ascribe the accentuation of the radical words, where their genitive represents the infinitive, to the circumstance, that the infinitive outbids the common abstracts by greater power of life and action, and it will be well to recall what has been before (§ 814) said regarding the double kind of accentuation of the forms in *tâ* (*tri*), according as they, as participles, govern the accusative, or stand as more inactive nouns of agency The datives, too, of abstract radical words have, where they stand as infinitives, in general the more powerful accentuation, at least in the cases in which, according to Pânini (III 4 14), the infinitive in *ê* (in the technical language *k-ê-n*) takes the place of the future passive participle, as in the above-mentioned (§ 855) example *atī-kramê*, in opposition to the oxytonised *atīśc* (Pân III 4 77 ; Rîgv I 23 21)

† *Madhyâ kartôs*, "in the midst of doing (of work)" *Madhyâ* is an abbreviation of *madhyê* (= *madhyai*, see § 196), where the suppression of

or the instrumental *kr̥itā* after, or 'with, or through making to the accusative which springs from the base *kr̥tu* or to the common infinitive *kr̥tum* as also to the datives *kr̥tāi* *kr̥tādi*, and to the genitive *kr̥tōs* and in general, the relation of the gerunds in *tā* to the infinitives of the same root it must be observed that the gerund in roots which admit of increment or weakening always exhibits the weaker form of the root and has the accent, without exception on the case termination Compare e g

INFINITIVE	GERUND	ROOT
<i>vaktum</i>	<i>uktā</i>	<i>vac</i> to speak
<i>svaptum</i>	<i>suptā</i>	<i>svap</i> to sleep
<i>pruṣhtum</i>	<i>pruṣhtā</i>	<i>prach</i> to ask
<i>yāshtum</i>	<i>ishitā</i>	<i>yaj</i> to offer
<i>grahitum</i>	<i>grahitā</i>	<i>grah</i> to take
<i>śrōtum</i>	<i>śrutā</i>	<i>śru</i> to hear
<i>bhāvitum</i>	<i>bhūtā</i>	<i>bhu</i> to be
<i>yōktum</i>	<i>yuktā</i>	<i>yuj</i> to join
<i>bhettum</i>	<i>bhittā</i>	<i>bhid</i> to cleave
<i>sthātum</i>	<i>sthitā</i>	<i>sthā</i> to stand
<i>hāntum</i>	<i>hatā</i>	<i>han</i> to slay

[C. I. p. 124]

864 This distinction in the form of the root and of the accentuation does not prevent the assumption that the gerund and the infinitive originally had the same theme and the same accentuation that e g together with *yōktum* to join a *yōktā* after with or through joining may have existed just as the distinction which exists in the participle present between the strong and weak cases

of the case termination is compensated by lengthening the final vowel of the base, in which respect compare Latin datives like *lupo* from *lupōi* (see § 200, and compare *वासन्त* *vasanta* for *वासन्ते* *vasantē* in the Schol to Pan VII 1 39)

cannot have been an original one, and, *e g.*, to the accusative *tudántam* an instrumental *tudántā* must have corresponded; for which, in the language as it has remained to us, the oxytone *tudatá*, which has also lost the nasal, is left (cf p. 1051) As the weakening of the gerund occurs in the root, and not in the suffix, I further recall attention to the declension of *pathín*, "way," from whence spring only the middle cases, while the strong strengthen the root by the insertion of a nasal, and, at the same time, accentuate it, and, moreover, exhibit the suffix also in a stronger form (*pánthán* compared with *pathán*); while the weakest cases suppress the suffix, as also the nasal of the root, and let the accent sink down on the case-termination hence, *e g.*, in the instrumental we find *pathá* opposed to [G. Ed p 1242] *pánthānam*, "*viam*" and *pathibhyas* "*vias*" The declension of *váh*, "bearing" (at the end of compounds) also presents a great agreement with the formal relation of the gerund in *tvá* to the infinitive, that is to say, with those gerunds which, in roots beginning with *va*, suppress the *a* and vocalise the *v*, only in compounds in *váh* the long syllable *vá* is contracted in the weakest cases to long *û*, while the short syllable *va* of the gerunds is contracted to short *u* in other respects *śály-ûhá*, "through the rice-carrying," has the same relation to its accusative *śály-váham*, as, *e g.*, *uktvá* has to *váktum* A short *u* is exhibited by *anaḍ-váh*, "ox (wagon-drawer)", in the weak cases hence, *anaḍ-uhá*, *e g.*, stands exactly in the same relation to *anaḍ-váham*, as *uktvá* does to *váktum* With regard, however, to the circumstance that the feminine bases in *tu*, from which the gerund and the infinitive spring, have

* *Anaḍ-uh* is assumed to be the theme, but it admits of no doubt that *vah* is the true base of the final member of this compound, and that hence *uh* has arisen by contraction The nominative is *anaḍ-vân*, and presupposes a theme with a nasal *anaḍ-vānh* (cf § 786, suff *vāns*)

undergone a weakening only in the instrumental *i e* in the gerund but not in the other weak cases we may perhaps look for the reason of this in the extremely frequent use of the instrumental of the gerund as the forms most used are also most subject to detraction or weakening, for which reason *e g* the root of the verb substantive *as* loses its vowel before the heavy terminations of the present while no other root beginning with a vowel undergoes such an abbreviation in any form whatever Should the formal relation of the gerund in *tā* to the infinitive in *tum* be independent of the *as* it were moral principle which operates in the separation into strong and [G Ld p 1243] weak cases I would assume and I have already elsewhere alluded to it * that the weight *tvā* laid on the termination *tum* has had a similar influence on the preceding portion of the word both with respect to the weakening of the form and the removal of the accent as that exercised in the 2d principal conjugation by the weight of the heavy personal terminations In that case therefore the relation of *e g i tvā* to *etum dvish tvā* to *dīsh tum vi tvā* to *vet tum, dat tvā* to *dā tum hi tvā* to *hā tum* would answer more or less to that of

<i>i mās,</i>	we go	to	<i>e mi</i>	I go
<i>dvish mas</i>	we hate	to	<i>dīsh mi</i>	I hate
<i>vid mas</i>	we know	to	<i>iēd-mi</i>	I know
<i>dad mas</i>	we give	to	<i>dadā mi</i>	I give
<i>rahi-mas</i>	we quit"	to	<i>jahā mi</i>	I quit

Be that, however as it may it is certain that the gerund in *tv ā* and the infinitives in *tu m tō s tav ē tav-ai* have a common formative suffix and in essentials are only distinguished by their case termination and that the abstract substantive base formed by *tu* is feminine which before

* Smaller Sanscrit Grammar § 669

could only have been inferred from the instrumental in *tv-ā*,[†] but now is also apparent from the Védic dative forms in *tv-āi*. The Greek abstracts in *τύ-ς*, as *βοητύ-ς*, *βρωτύ-ς*, *ἐδητύ-ς*, *ἐπητύ-ς*, *ἐλεητύ-ς*, *γλα-σ-τύ-ς*, *ὀρχη-σ-τύ-ς*, which were first brought into this province of formation in my treatise on the "Influence of Pronouns on the formation of Words" (p 25),

[G Ed p 1244] testify in like manner for the feminine nature of the Sanscrit cognate words they, however, testify also, and this is well worth notice, that it was after the separation of the Greek from the Sanscrit that this class of abstract substantives raised itself in Sanscrit to the position of infinitives and gerunds, while they still moved in Zend also in the circle of common substantives. Under this head is to be brought *𐬨𐬀𐬭𐬀* *pērē-tu*, the feminine gender of which is proved by the accusative plural *pērētūs*, but its abstract nature has been changed into concrete. It, perhaps, originally signified "passage, crossing," | but has, however, assumed the signification "bridge." Perhaps, too, *𐬨𐬀𐬭𐬀* *zantu*, "city" (originally, perhaps, "production, creation"), the gender of which is not to be deduced from the forms that now occur, is to be classed here. The instrumental *𐬨𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬨𐬀* *zanthuā*, "through production," mentioned above (§ 254 Rem 3 p 280), as also *𐬨𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬨𐬀𐬨𐬀* *janthwa*, "through smiting, slaying," ‡ and the ablative *zanthuāt*, I now rather refer to the suffix *thwa* = Sanscrit *tva*, as in the Vêda dialect the said suffix also forms primitive abstracts (see § 829), and, indeed, from the strong form of the root, so that from *𐬢𐬀* *jan* and *𐬨𐬀* *han* might be expected the bases *𐬢𐬀𐬨𐬀* *jantva* and *𐬨𐬀𐬨𐬀* *hantva*. I am led to this opinion particu-

- From a masculine or neuter base, in classical Sanscrit at least, would come *tunā*

† Root *pērē* = Sanscrit *par* (*prī*), see Brockhaus, Glossary, p 376

‡ See § 160 p 178, where *janthwa* should be read for *zanthwa*. In the Ger ed § 159 is here wrongly given for § 160

larly by the ablative *ṣaṁṣṭṣaṁ zanthuāt** which answers
* better to a theme *zanthua* than to *zantu* as from bases in
u no other ablatives in *āt* have elsewhere been found but only
such as have short *a* before the *t* or those [G Ed p 1245]
that append the ablative sign direct to the theme The
instrumentals in *thua* (or *thud* see § 251 Rem 3 p 281)
admit of being deduced from feminine bases in *tu* quite as
well as from neuter or masculine in *thua* But it is de-
cidedly from a base in *thua* that the accusative *raṭhucēm*

defiling † comes from the theme of which *raṭhura* proceeds the denominative *raṭhuayēti* he defiles. The primitive verb does not occur whence it is uncertain whether *raṭhura* is really a primitive abstract.

865 It is clear that the Latin supines are identical in their base with the Sanscrit infinitive bases in *tu* although the analogous abstracts with a full declension as *or-tu-s inter-tu-s sta-tu-s ac-tu-s duc-tu-s rap-tu-s ac-cis-su-s* (from *ac-cis-tu-s* see § 101) *cā-su-s* (from *car-su-s* for *cas-tus*) *cur-su-s* *rom-tu-s* ‡ have like their analogous forms in

* V S p 83, ၃၁၁၀၆၇၄၄ မၤလၢ မၤလၢ para nars "ahthwāt"
' ante hominis generationem see Gram Crit p 253

† Cf. Spiegel, "The 10th Farg. of the V S," p. 62.

† The Sanscrit also frequently joins the suffix under discussion to the root by means of a conjunctive vowel: and forms *eg* from *vam* to vomit the base *camitu* whence the infinitive *cam : tum* (=sup *rom : tum*) and the gerund *cam : tū*. With regard however to the infinitive and gerund not universally agreeing as to the insertion or not of the conjunctive vowel and to our finding by the side of the infinitive *blā : tum* "to be" *eg* a gerund *blā : tū* I would recall attention to the circumstance that the suffix *tans* of the perfect participle when it is appended to the root by a conjunctive vowel: rejects this conjunctive vowel in the weakest cases (instr *pēch ush-a* opposed to the acc *pēch : tans am*) which does not prevent me from assuming that in this participle all cases originally came from the same base. We do not require to explain the absence of the conjunctive vowel in the weakest cases by the circumstance that here the formative suffix begins with a vowel, as *pēch y ushā* (for *pech i ushā*)

[G. Ed. p 1216] Greek, not remained true to the feminine gender. How exactly in other respects, in many roots, the accusative of the Latin supine agrees with that of the Sanscrit infinitive, exclusive of the gunising of the latter, may be inferred from the following examples

SANSKRIT	LATIN
<i>sthā-tum</i> , "to stand,"	<i>stātum</i>
<i>dā-tum</i> , "to give,"	<i>datum</i>
<i>dhmā-tum</i> , "to blow,"	<i>flātum</i>
<i>jñā-tum</i> , "to know,"	<i>nōtum</i>
<i>pā-tum</i> , "to drink,"	<i>pōtum</i>
<i>ē-tum</i> , "to go"	<i>itum</i> (cf. ἵτυς)
<i>śē-tum</i> , "to sleep,"	<i>quētum</i>
<i>yā-tum</i> , <i>yār-i-tum</i> , "to join,"	<i>jūtum</i>
<i>srō-tum</i> , "to flow,"	<i>rutum</i> (cf. <i>ruus</i>)
<i>stār-tum</i> , "to stick,"	<i>strātum</i>
<i>pāk-tum</i> , "to cook,"	<i>coctum</i>
<i>ūnk-tum</i> , "to anoint,"	<i>unctum</i>

pēch-i-ūshā) could as little surprise us, as, *e g*, *nunāy-i-tha* (with *nun-ⁱ-tha*), from the root *nī*, "to lead," which prefixes a conjunctive vowel *i* at pleasure to the personal termination *tha*, and necessarily to the personal endings *va*, *ma*, *sē*, *vahē*, *mahē*, *dhi ē*, hence *niny-i-vā*, *niny-i-mā*, *niny-i-shē*, &c. The verbs of the 10th class, and the causal forms which are analogous to them, have all of them, as well in the infinitive as in the gerund, the conjunctive vowel *i* after the character *ay* (for *aya* of the special tenses), and gunise radical vowels which are capable of Guna; hence, *e g*, *chōr-ay-i-tum*, *chōr-ay-i-tvā*, from *chur*, "to steal" To the *ay* corresponds the Latin *ā* or *i*, from forms like *am-ā-tum*, *aud-ī-tum* (see § 109¹ 6) On the other hand, verbs of the Latin 2d conjugation, though they are based in like manner on the Sanscrit 10th class, relinquish their conjugational character, and add the suffix either direct to the root, or by means of a conjunctive vowel *i* (*doc-tum*, *mon-i-tum*, for *doc-ē-tum*, *mon-ē-tum*, cf. § 801 Note †, p 1115 Note †*, G ed) *flē-tum*, *plē-tum* make a necessary exception, *dēl-ē-tum* makes a voluntary one

SANSKRIT	LATIN	
<i>bhank tum</i> to break	<i>fractum</i>	[G Ed p 1247]
<i>bhrāsh tum</i> to roast (r <i>bhray</i>)	<i>frictum</i>	
<i>yōk tum</i> to join	<i>unctum</i>	
<i>āt tum</i> to eat	<i>esum</i> (see § 101)	
<i>chhēt tum</i> to cleave	<i>scissum</i>	
<i>bhet tum</i> id	<i>fissum</i>	
<i>tōt tum</i> to knock "	<i>tusum</i> (from <i>tus sum</i> for <i>tus-</i> <i>tum</i> see § 101)	
<i>rat tum</i> to rend "	<i>rōsum</i>	
<i>vēt tum</i> to know "	<i>vi sum</i> (from <i>vis sum vis tum</i>)	
<i>un i tum</i> to beget to bring forth to become	<i>gen i tum</i>	
<i>sun i tum</i> toound	<i>son i tum</i>	
<i>lōp tum</i> to break	<i>ruptum</i>	
<i>sārṣ-tum</i> to go	<i>serptum</i>	
<i>vum i tum</i> to vomit	<i>vom i tum</i>	
<i>desh tum</i> to shew	<i>dictum</i>	
<i>pūsh tum</i> to bruise	<i>pistum</i>	
<i>dōg-dhum *</i> to milk	<i>ductum</i>	
<i>mē-dhum †</i> <i>mingere</i>	<i>mictum</i>	
<i>iō dhum</i> to ride	<i>iectum</i>	

866 The form which in the Lithuanian and Lettish Grammars is called *supinum* corresponds remarkably with the accusative of the supine in Latin in that it is used only after verbs of motion in order to express the object towards which the motion is directed i.e. the purpose for which it takes place (cf p 1209 G ed) [C Ed p 1248] The accusative sign the nasal of which is elsewhere in Lithuanian marked on the preceding vowel (see § 149) is

* Euphonic for *d h tum* from the root *duh*=Gothic *tuh* (*tuha* ' I draw *tau*' ' I drew)

† For *mēh tum* whence next comes *mēd dhum*

altogether lost in this form, though it is preserved in its original shape in the already before-noticed composites like *butum-bime* (see §. 685 p 913, and §. 687.), under the protection of the following labial I annex a few Lithuanian supine constructions out of the translation of the Bible *iszėyo sėjėjas sėltu*, "A sower went forth to sow" (Matt xiii 3), *kad nuėyen in miestelus, saw nusipirkto ualgin*, "that they may go (going) into the villages to buy themselves victuals" (xiv. 15), *nuėyens yeszėktu paklydusen*, "going to seek that which is gone astray" (xviii. 12), *yus iszėyote . . sugautu mannen*, "are ye come out for to take me?" (xxvi 55). Nevertheless, the use of this supine in the received condition of the Lithuanian after verbs of motion is not exclusively requisite, but we find in the translation of the Bible, in such constructions, more frequently the common infinitive in *ti*, or with *i*, suppressed *t'*, e g, Matt. ix. 11, *asz atėyau grieszmūsus vadinti*, "I am come to call sinners" (cf. Sanscrit *vad*, "to speak"); x 31, *asz ne atėyau pakayun susti*, "I am not come to send peace," v 17, *ne atėyau panukinti, bet iszpilditi*, "I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil" On the other hand, the Old Prussian a language which approaches the Lithuanian very closely has two forms for the common infinitive, of which the one corresponds to the accusative of the Sanscrit infinitive and Latin supine, as also to the Lithuanian supine; and, indeed, as in the common declension, retaining the sign of the accusative in the form of *n*; e g, *dā-tun* or [G Ed p 1249] *dā-ton*, "to give" = Sanscrit *dātum*, *pā-ton*, "to drink" = *pā-tum*, *gem-ton*, "to bear a child" = *jān-i-tum*; and the other, with the termination *tuer*, presents a remarkable similarity to the above-mentioned (§ 854) Vêdic infinitive dative in *tarāi* (for *tiāi*), of which no trace is left in any other cognate language of Europe It has, however,

unconscious of its origin in like manner in accusative signification where I would remind the reader, that in the Vedas also the infinitives in *dhyāi* discussed above (§ 854) in spite of their dative form occasionally suppress the accusative relation, thus Yajurveda VI 3 *śīmasi gāmadhyāi*

we will go * As regards, then the Prussian form in *tu ei* if we deduce *tu ei ei* answers as the feminine case termination to the pronominal datives in *ei* as *ste-ssā ei* this = Sanscrit *ta sy āi* Gothic *thi z ai* (see § 319 p 455) It might however be that the *ei* of the said infinitive form may be based on the Sanscrit *e* (= *ai*) of the Veda forms in *ta i ē* so that *e g dā tu ei* to give would have the same relation to its accusative *dā tu n* that in the Veda dialect, the to be presupposed *dā ta i ē* which without Guna would be *dā tu ē* has to *dā tum* The Rigveda furnishes us with *pā ta i ē* the sister form to *pu tu ei* to drink" (I 28. e) The other Prussian forms which belong to this class and which Nesselmann p 65 has collected are *bā tu ei* *bā tu ei †* to fear (Sanskrit *bhū* to fear *bhaya* fear) *stā tu ei* to stand *at-ā tu ei* to answer *bihi tu ei* to say (Sanskrit *bru* to speak) [G Ed p 120] *en dyrē tu ei* to regard (Sanskrit *dars dṛis* to see) *pallaps-i tu ei ‡* to covet (Sanskrit *hlaps* infinitive *hlapsi*

* In another passage of the Yajurveda (III 13) the infinitives *āhu i ādhyāi* "to summon" and *mādayādhyāi*, to rejoice, are governed by a verb (according to the Schol, *ichchāmi* I wish I will") and have in like manner, an accusative meaning *ubhā vām indr gni āhurādhyā ubhā radhasah sahā mādayādhyāi* Ye both Indra and Agni (will I) call, both will together gladden on account of riches

† For *tu ei* occur also *tu ei*, *tu ei* and *tu ei* see Nesselmann, p 65

‡ *Pa* is a prefix and the initial consonant of the root doubled according to the inclination peculiar to the Prussian to double consonants Compare the Sanskrit root *labh* to attain (λ α β ν ω λαβον) the desiderative of which would regularly be *hlaps* (see § 700) for which *laps* From *labh* to attain appears, too through mere weakening of the vowel

tum, "to wish to attain, r. *labh*), *hirdî-twei*, "to hear," *madli-twei*, "to ask," *au-schaudî-twei*, "to trust," *schlûst-twei*, "to serve," *turri-twei*, "to have," *wacki-twei*, "to allure," *gallin-twei*, "to slay," *leigin-twey*, "to direct," *smunn-twey*, "to honour," *sundin-twei*, "to punish," *swintin-twei*, "to hallow," *menen-twey*, "to think, to mention" (Sanskrit *man*, "to think"), *gir-twei*, "to praise" (Vêd *gir*, "song of praise," *gir-nâ-mi*, "I praise"), *gun-twei*, "to drive," *lum-twei*, *lemb-twey*, "to break" (Sanskrit *lump-ô-mi*, "I break"), *ranc-twei*, *ranck-twey*, "to steal," † *is-twei*, *is-tue*, "to eat," ‡ *tiens-twei*, "to fascinate," *ues-twei* (from *wed-twei*), "to conduct"

867. More frequent than the infinitives in *tum*, *ton*, and *twei*, are, in the Old Prussian language, the infinitives in *t*; as, *da-t*, "to give," *sta-t*, "to stand," *bou-t*, "to be," *guw-i-t*, "to live," *teick-u-t*, "to procure" (Sanskrit *talsh*, in the Vêda dialect, "to make"). These have, as I doubt not, lost a final *z*, and answer to the Lithuanian infinitives in *ti*, the *z* of which is also frequently apostrophised (see [G Ed p. 1251] p 1248 G. ed), and in Lettish, as in Prussian, is utterly lost § Here also are to be ranked the

vowel, the root *lubh*, "to covet," to have sprung The Prussian root *lap*, "to command," appears to belong to the Sanskrit *lap*, "to speak"

* *En-wackêmai*, "we invoke," cf Sanskrit *vach* (from *vak*), infinitive *vaktum*, "to speak"

† Akin to this is, among other words, the Lithuanian *rankà*, "hand," as "taking," Old Prussian accusative *ranka-n*, plural accusative *ranka ns* In Sanskrit the as-yet-unciteable root *ruk* (also *lak*) means "to obtain"

‡ Euphonic for *id-twei*, *id-twe* (see § 457), cf Sanskrit infinitive *at-tum* from *ad-tum*.

§ The following are examples in Lettish *yah-t* (= *jâ-t*), "to rule" (cf Sanskrit root *yâ*, "to go"), *see-t*, "to bind" (Sanskrit root *si*, *id*); *ee-t*, "to go," *bih-t* (= *bî-t*), "to be afraid" (Sanskrit root *bhî*), *buh-t* (= *bût*), "to be" (Lithuanian *bu-ti*, Sanskrit *bhû-ti*, "the being"), *wem-t*, "vomere" (Sanskrit root *vam*)

Old Slavonic infinitives which however have constantly preserved the *z* of the suffix hence *e g* ѣсти *yas ti* (euphonic for *yad ti*) to eat as compared with the Lithuanian *ēs ti* and Prussian *is t*. The source of these infinitives is most probably as has been already elsewhere remarked * the Sanscrit feminine abstracts in *ti* (see § 844) with whose theme the Lithuanian and Old Slavonic infinitives are as regards their suffix identical compare *buti* бѣти *byti* "to be" with the Sanscrit *bhūti* *existentia*, *eiti* ейти *iti* to go with *इति* *iti* the going (only retained in *sam iti* fight properly coming together) As however such base words except at the beginning of compounds do not occur in the languages it becomes a question what case is represented by the Slavonic Lithuanian infinitive forms in *ti*. I believe the dative for the accusative which according to sense would be more suitable would lead us to expect in Lithuanian *tin* and in Slavonic *тъ ty* (cf *костъ kosty* from the base *kosti* p 349) but in the dative and the locative which is of the same form with it the Old Slavonic *z* bases are not distinguished from their theme (see § 268 and p 348) and in Lettish also the bases in *z* exhibit in the dative and at the same time also in the accusative the bare primary form of which the *z* in the nominative and genitive is suppressed hence *e g* *aw s* as nominative and genitive for Sanscrit *avi s*, *avē s* Latin *ovi s* *ovi s* but dative and accusative *awi* and in the Lithuanian in the common declension of bases in *z* the dative is probably dis- [G Ed p 1202] tinguished from the base only in this that it reaches into another province of declension†. If now the Slavonic and Lithuanian infinitives are properly datives in spite of the accusative relation which they generally express they

* Influence of Pronouns on the formation of Words " p 30

† See p 48 Note † and § 193

368. I regard as accusatives, though in like manner without case-termination, and as originally identical with the Sanscrit infinitive accusatives in *tum*, and their Latin and Lithuanian sister-forms, the Old Slavonic infinitives in *тъ t'* called "supines," which are governed only by verbs of motion as the object of the motion, but from such constructions also are expelled in the more modern MSS. and printed books by the common infinitives in *ти ti* (see Dobrowsky, p 1253). Taken as accusative, the termination *тъ t'* has the same relation to the Sanscrit *tum* that *сынъ syn'*, "*filium*," has to *सुनुम् sūnūm* *. In the dative we should expect *toiv* after the analogy of *сынѡви synov-i*, "*filio*" = Sanscrit *sūnar-ê*, Lithuanian *sunu-i*. The examples given by Dobrowsky (pp 645, 646), are *моучитъ mûcht'* ("art thou come hither to torment us?" Matt viii 29); *оучитъ ūcht'*; *проповѣдаѣтъ propovyedat'*, ("He departed thence to teach and to preach," xi 1.), *видѣтъ vidyct'* ("what

* Lithuanian *sunu-n*, Gothic *sunu*, see § 262

went ye out to see? $\chi 1$ 7) сѣяти *syeyat* (a sower went forth to sow III 3) прѣзвѣстити *v žoryestit* (they did run to bring word xxviii 8) In respect of syntax it deserves notice that the Old Slavonic supines can be also used in construction like common substantives with the genitive, so Matt viii 29 *muchit nas* to torment us instead of *ny*

869 We return to the Latin supine in order to consider more closely the form in *tu*. As ablative it answers at least in respect of signification to the Vedic ablative of the infinitive in *lps* (= *laus*) which however has not hitherto been found in its strict ablative function but only governed by prepositions (see § 862) while the corresponding Latin form in *tu* avoids the construction with prepositions. Its ablative nature however is clearly shewn where the ablative of another abstract stands beside it in a similar relation, as Terence *parvum dictu sed immensum expectatione*, Liv *pleraque dictu quam re sunt faciliora*. As the 4th declension also admits datives in *u* for *ui* we might regard the supine in *tu* when it stands by adjectives which govern the dative as a dative thus *e.g. jucundum cognitu atque auditu* as = *cognitui auditui*. I would rather [G Ed p 1954] however not concede to the suffix a 3d case and believe that the form in *tu* may everywhere be taken as an ablative and indeed in most cases as an ablative more closely defined which can be paraphrased by on account of in respect to as above *dictu quam re faciliora*. The assertion however that it is possible to express the relation of removal by the ablative of the supine I now retract since in a passage in Cato R.R. (*primus cubitu surgat postremus cubitum eat*) I no longer agree with Vossius (see also Rams horn p 452) in recognising the supines of *cumbo* but only the common ablative and accusative of the concrete *cubitus* couch bed therefore 'Rise the first from bed go last to bed. Moreover in *obsonatu redeo* (Plaut) and *redcunt*

pastu oves, I cannot, with G. F. Grotefend (p. 347, see also Ramshorn p. 452), recognise the ablative of the supine, as the ablative of *obsonatus* and *pastus*, with which the said supine is, in its origin, certainly identical here, suffices very well. It is, however, certain, that the Latin supines, in respect to syntax, stand very near to the common abstracts of the 4th declension, and I do not think that the Latin brought its supines with it as such, or as infinitives, so early as from the Asiatic progenital land, but I now only assume a formative affinity with the Sanscrit infinitives in *tu-m*, as with the Greek abstracts in *τυς*, but I admit of the syntactical individualization of the Latin supines first shewing itself on Roman soil, as, indeed, in the older Latinity also, the abstracts in *to* have obtained the capacity, like infi-

[G Ed p 1255.] nitives, of governing the accusative' which the more modern language has again resigned. The case is different with the forms of the Lithuanian and Slavonic supines, which correspond to the Latin supines and the Old Prussian infinitive (§§ 866. 466), which stand in the said languages isolated, and without any support on a class of words provided with a full declension, and shew themselves to be transmissions from the time of identity with the Sanscrit and the earlier, as the said languages, through several other phenomena, point to the fact that they were first separated from the Sanscrit at a time when the latter language had already experienced sundry corruptions, with which the classic and German tongues are not yet acquainted.†

- The following are examples in Plautus *Quid tibi hanc digito tactio est?* *quid tibi istunc tactio est?* *quid tibi hanc notio est?* *quid tibi hanc aditio est?* *quid tibi huc receptio ad te est meum virum?* *quid tibi hanc curatio est?* This idiom therefore appears to have been retained, or generally to have been adopted, in questions only

† I have expressed myself more fully on this subject in a treatise read before the Academy several years ago, but still unprinted, "On the Language

870 We ought not to ascribe a passive [G Ed p 1256] signification to the ablative of the supine at least it cannot

guage of the Old Prussians and I have there appealed in particular to the palatal *s*, which has arisen from *h* for which the classical languages exhibit the original guttural tennis the German languages *h* (according to the rule for the permutation of sound see § 87) while the Lettish and Slavonic languages in most of the words which admit of comparison give likewise a sibilant Compare *e g*, Sanscrit *asia s* a horse " *āsta* a mare with the Lithuanian *as-wa*, contrasted with the Latin *equus equa*, Old Saxon *ehu stan* (th) nom *sia* dog with the Lithuanian *szu* (nom) gen *szun s* contrasted with the Greek *κυν*, Latin *canis* Gothic *hund(a) s* *sata m* a hundred with the Lithuanian *szinta s* (masc) Old Slavonic *sto* (nent) contrasted with the Latin *centum*, Greek *κατον* (p 415) *sakha* 'bough' with Lithuanian *szakha* Russian *suk* contrasted with the Irish *geag* By another process Kuhn (see Wehr's Indian Studies p 324) has arrived at the opinion that the Slavonic languages have continued longer united with the Indian or still more probably, longer with the Zend and the Persian, than with the others of the Indo Germanic family I cannot however assume a special affinity between the Slavonic (and Lettish) and the Arian languages (the Zend Persian, Kurdish Afghan Armenian Ossetish) and in the forementioned treatise regarding the Old Prussian I have drawn attention to the fact, that an especial peculiarity of the Arian languages consists in this that they have all of them before vowels, and the most part before semi vowels also as well at the beginning as in the middle of words, changed the original or dental *s* (स) into *h* or entirely suppressed it This token however fails in the Slavonic and Lettish languages which in this respect have maintained themselves on a level with the Sanscrit Compare *e g* the Lithuanian *septyni* Slavonic *sedmy* with the Zend *hapta*, Persian *haft* the Armenian *yethn yefthankh* Ossetish *awd* and Afghan *ota* When, however the Slavonic Lettish languages at times accord with the Arian in that they contrast with the Sanscrit *ह* a sibilant as *e g* in the nominative singular of the pronoun of the 1st person (see p 471) I regard it in so far as casual inasmuch as I believe that the two groups of languages (the Lettish Slavonic and Arian) in these on the whole but rare coincidences have reached a common goal by separate routes as the Greek through its rough breathing frequently coincides with the Arian *h* (cf. *e g* *πτα* with the Zend *hapta*), without however, the change of the original *s* into the rough breathing

[G Ed p 1257] be assigned with more right to it than to other abstract substantives, in which it can be inferred only

at the beginning of words having become a principle; for the Greek contrasts, *c g*, σὺν, for Sanscrit *sam*, with the Zend *ham*. The Sanscrit *ḡh* is properly an aspirated *g* (*gh*), and, in pronunciation, has the same relation to *ḡh* that the Greek *χ* has to the Sanscrit *h* (*k + l*), in which, as generally in the Sanscrit aspirates, an *h* is clearly heard after the word terminal or medial. The Sanscrit *h* is therefore, as it were, a weak *χ*, and leads us, in the Lettish-Slavonic languages, which have no aspirates, to expect a *g*, which we here also frequently find in the place of the Sanscrit *h*, as, *c. g.*, in Lithuanian *degu*, "I burn" = Sanscrit *daham*, and in the Slavonic *МОГ* *mogun*, "I can," which is based on the Sanscrit root *man*, *mah*, "to grow," whence *महत्* *mahát*, "great" (cf. *magnus*, *μεγας*), to which the Zend *𐬨𐬀𐬭𐬀* *mazó* is radically akin, with *z*, therefore, contrasted with the Sanscrit *h* and Slavonic, Greek, and Latin *g*. Where, however, the Lithuanian contrasts a *z* (= French *j*, Slavonic *h*) and the Slavonic a *з* with the Sanscrit *h*, there I regard the sibilant of the said languages, not as a corruption of the Sanscrit *h*, but of a *g*, in the same manner as, in Italian, the *g* before *e* and *i* has, in pronunciation, become *dsci* (English *j*) moreover, in this case the Lettish and Slavonic languages, in spite of their near relationship, no longer invariably agree with one another, since, *c. g.*, the Russian contrasts with the Sanscrit *hansa*, "goose," the form *гусь* *gusy*, and the Lithuanian the form *žavis*. In the Zend this word would, in its theme, be either *𐬭𐬀𐬨𐬀𐬭𐬀* *zapha* or *𐬭𐬀𐬨𐬀𐬭𐬀* *janha* (see §§ 563. 57), the *h* of which the Lettish-Slavonic languages would have scarcely conducted back to its point of departure, *s*. I would also recall attention to the fact, that in the Lettish and Slavonic languages occasionally weak sibilants occur for the Sanscrit *g* or the *ḡh*, which was first developed out of the *g* after the separation of languages. Thus the Lithuanian *žada-s*, "speech," and *žodi-s*, "word," lead to the Sanscrit root *gad*, "to speak," for which, in Zend, we have *𐬕𐬀𐬭𐬀* *jad*, "to require." To the Sanscrit root *𐬕𐬀𐬭𐬀* *giva*, "to live," corresponds the Slavonic root *жив* *shiv*, while the Lithuanian in this root has preserved the original guttural (*gyvas*, "living," *gyven*, "I live"), which is a proof that the corruption of the original guttural in this root, in Sanscrit and Slavonic, first made its appearance after the separation of the Lettish-Slavonic languages from Sanscrit. The divergence of the Let-

from the general sense whether the action passes from the subject or to it as in general the abstract substantives ex

tish and Slavonic languages in the word 'God' deserves notice for while the Lithuanian *dievas* and Prussian *deuwa* are based on the Sanscrit *dēva* 'God' (Zend *dauua* 'evil spirit') the word *bog* (theme *bogo*) which is common to perhaps all the Slavonic languages leads us to the Old Persian *baga* with which Kuhn also I c has compared it while I at a time when I was as yet unacquainted with the Old Persian expression (Glossarium Sanscr., Fasc II a 1841 p 212) compared it with भगवत् *bhagavat* (from *bhaga* *felicitas beatitudo*) *felix beatus venerabilis* (applied only to gods and saints) and under भग *bhaga* I have mentioned the Lithuanian *bagota* and Russian *bagoty* rich (cf Mikl "Radices s v БОГЪ *bog* 'deus') The Sanscrit root *bhag* from *bhag* signifies to worship to adore to love and as the suffix *a* has also a passive signification the old Persian and Slavonic term for 'God' might originally have also signified 'worshipped adored' the possibility of which with regard to the Slavonic word is also admitted by Pott (E I I p 236) I would however by no means found an argument for a special affinity between the Slavonic languages and the Old Persian on their agreement in the designation of God (in Persian gods) as the Sanscrit itself supplies a very satisfactory root for that, and moreover two languages might very easily have fallen upon the same method quite independently of each other so as to have designated God or gods from 'adoration' as too the New Persian *درد* *sed* 'God' is based on another root for to pray viz on *yaj* (Zend *yaz*) whence the perfect passive participle is by contraction *ishtu* Though the opinion expressed above (§§ 21 50) and supported also by Burnouf (*Yaçna*, p 173) be correct with regard to the original identity of the Lithuanian *suanta* 'holy,' Old Slavonic *свѣтъ* *svant*, id *sancti* *care* see Mikl Rad p 79 Russian *svnt* 'holy' acc *svnta* *n* *svintunt* 'to hallow' it is nevertheless important to observe that in this word also the Lettish and Slavonic languages have thereby diverged from the Arian or Medo Persian in that they have not changed the Sanscrit group of sounds *sv* into *sp* but have left the old semi vowel unaltered The Sanscrit supplies as the original source of the word under discussion (see Weber, V S Sp II 68) the extremely fruitful root *svi* 'to grow' in the contracted form *su*, if this be not the old form and *svi* an extension of it From *svi* we might expect *stayanta* according to the

[G Ed p 1258] press in no degree whatever the relation of activity or passiveness. Moreover, the Sanscrit infinitive is wanting in a passive form, and where it has, or appears to have, a passive signification, this is discoverable only from the context, as, *e.g.*, in a passage of the Sâvitri (5 15), of which I annex the translation "this man, bound by duty . . . deserves not to be summoned by my servants," more literally, "is not deserving the summoning" (*nû 'rîhó nêtum*), where the circumstance that *nîtum* can be rendered by a passive infinitive does not justify us in assigning to it a passive signification. It has, if one will so view it, an active meaning with reference to the servants of Yama, and a passive with reference to *Saljavân*, while in

[G Ed p 1259] point of fact it denotes neither activity nor passiveness, but the abstract "summoning, leading away," which is itself irrespective of doing or suffering. So also in the Hitôpadêśa (ed. Bonn. p. 41), *abhushêktum*, "to sprinkle," has no passive signification, which Lassen (II 75) would make this infinitive borrow from the passive participle *nirûpita*. In my opinion, *nirûpita* retains its passive meaning for itself, and does not consign it to the infinitive. That however, *i.e.*, the sprinkling (the kingly inauguration by sprinkling) is not performed by the elephant of the said person, but by another, is clear from the context. In order to leave the active or passive relation as undefined as in the original, I translate *atarîrîdyê 'bhushêktum bhavân nirûpitah* by "to the sprinkling for the forest-sovereignty your honour is chosen."

871 We sometimes find the Vêdic dative also of the infinitive base in *tu* with an apparent passive infinitive signification, as, *e.g.*, S V (ed Benfey, p 143), *îndrâya sôma*

the analogy of *jayanta* (n pi, originally "conqueror"), and from *śu*, *śavanta*, and, without Guna, *śvanta*, to which the Slavonic *svantъ* *svant'*, theme *svanto*, would correspond admirably

pâtareḥ vritraghnā parishuchyase for Indra O Soma for drinking (in order to be drunk) for the slayer of Vritra thou art poured around Rīgṽ 28 e *īndrāya pātareḥ sunu sōmam* for Indra for drinking* express the Soma Thus also at times the above mentioned (§ 857) dative form of abstract radical words appears to supply the place of the passive infinitive e.g. Rīgṽ 59 e *ādhdārayo dūyā suryan drishe* thou hast placed the sun in the heaven to see † As a practical rule we may lay down the [G Ed p 1260] proposition for classical Sanscrit that where an instrumental of the person accompanies the infinitive in *tum* the former may, in languages which possess a passive infinitive be translated by it Thus in the passage cited above (*nā rhd nētum matpurasāh*) so also Mahā II 309 *na yuktas tu aramānō sya kartum tīayā* It is not however fitting for thee to shew contempt for this one (=that contempt be made) In another passage which is in essentials similar (Mahā I 769) the passive participle *yukta* be seeming fitting (properly joined) is not governed by the subject but stands impersonally in the neuter *na yuktam bhavatā ham anriteno pacharitam* not be seeming (is it) that I by thee with falsehood serve (=be served) ‡ There is also an interesting and hitherto in its kind unique passage in the Raghuvansī (14 42) *yady arthitā prānān mayā dhārayitūṁ chiraṁ rah* Irrespective of *mayā* by me

* = in order to be drunk Sayana explains *pātareḥ* by *pātaum* but here, in classical Sanscrit I should expect another abstract in the dative rather than the accusative of the infinitive

† = to be seen The Scholiast explains *dris* by *drāshtum* and then more closely by *sarīśham asmākan darśan ya* † on account of the seeing of us all

‡ Compare a passage in Savitri (II 22) where *sakyam* possible refers according to the sense to *dosha* masc 'fault *sacha doshaḥ prayatnena na sakyam atīartitum* and this fault it is impossible to overpass without utmost endeavour

the literal translation would be, "if your wish to retain life long," and then the obtaining of life would refer to the persons addressed; but by the appended *mayâ*, "by me," the sense is essentially altered, and the retention of life referred to the speaker, though the life might be that of those addressed if the context allowed of this, but *dhâra-*

[Ġ Ed p 1261] *ṛitum*, "to receive," remains, however, in so far, a genuine active infinitive, as it governs the accusative (pl) *pīṇān* "*vitam*" In order to imitate as closely the grammatical complexion of the original in translating it into German, we might perhaps render it thus, "if to you the wish (is) for the long retention of life through me," only here the word that signifies "to retain" must be rendered as the common abstract with the genitive, instead of as verbal with the accusative, and instead of the adverb "long" the corresponding adjective must be prefixed to it, while the proper infinitive is importantly distinguished from the common abstract by this, that it admits of no epithet.

872 It is worthy of notice, moreover, how the Sanscrit, being deficient in a passive infinitive, shifts for itself in cases where such an infinitive was to have been expected after verbs which signify "to be able" in such sentences as *vinci potest* The Sanscrit then, in such cases, expresses the passive relation by the auxiliary verb *शक्नुते* *śak*, "to be able," to which it has lent a passive, perhaps especially with a view to constructions of this kind, which, however, is only used impersonally, e g Mah. I 6678, *yadī śakyatē*, "if it is possible" (literally, "if it is could"),† on the other

* I.e. the infinitive in Sanscrit, which in the German is rendered by "*Erhalten*," must be regarded as a substantive "retention," not as verbal "retaining"—*Translator*

† The reader will pardon this expression, which must be coined in order to render "*wird gekonnt*" I had only the choice between it and "is been able"—*Translator*

hand *e g* Nal 20 5 *nā hartun sakyatē punah* it (the garment) cannot be recalled (literally is not can ed to recall) as if one could say in Latin *afferre nequitur* instead of *afferri nequit*. The Latin language however allows of the doubled expression of the passive relation both in the infinitive and in the negative auxiliary verb *nequeo* hence *e g* *comprimi nequitur* (Plaut Rud) *retrahi nequitur* (Plaut apud Fest) *ulcisci* (pass) *nequitur* (Sill) *virginitas reddi nequitur* (Apul). Observe also the way in which the passive of the infinitive future in Latin is paraphrased by the accusative of the supine [G Ed p 1262] with *iri*, where therefore the auxiliary verb has exactly as in the Sanscrit *sakyatē* is could, taken upon itself the denoting of the passive relation which the accusative of the supine like its cognate form in Sanscrit is incapable of expressing thus *amatum iri* literally gone to love (in love) instead of to go to be loved. That too the indicative of *iri* can be used in constructions of this kind is proved by a passage in Cato (apud Gell 10 14) *contumelia per hujusce petulantiam mihi factum iri* Insult is gone to do to me instead of goes to be done to me *

* I first drew attention to the peculiarity of Sanscrit idiom as regards the construction of the passive of *sak* to be able with the infinitive in my review of Forster's Essay on the principles of the Sanscrit Grammar (Hendelberg Ann Reg 1818 No 30 p 476) and afterwards in a Note on Arjuna's journey to Indra's heaven p 81 and I believe that it was desirable to express a meaning on this subject as the singularity of a passive to a verb which signifies 'to be able' and the circumstance that *sak* admits also of being used as a middle of the 4th class (*e g* *sakyasē* thou canst N XI 6) might also induce the opinion that the Sanscrit infinitive in *tum* has both a passive and an active meaning and that therefore *e g* *hantun sakyate* literally signifies nothing else than *occidi potest*. This is, however, opposed by the passages in which infinitives are dependent on the decidedly passive participles of the preterite *sakita* (see p 1118 Note †) and of the future *sikyā* *e g* Ram I 44 53, *punar na sakita nitun ganga prarthajata*

[G Ed p 1263] 873 Let us now turn to the German infinitive, and we will, in the first place, call attention to the remarkable agreement which the Gothic shews to the Sanscrit in this, that in the want of a passive infinitive in the cases in which this form, did it exist, would be placed after the auxiliary verb signifying "to be able" (*mag*, "I can," "I am able") it expresses the passive relation in the auxiliary verb. As, however, *mag*, "I can," is a preterite with a present signification (cf § 491), and as the Gothic is not in a position to form a passive, except out of present forms (see § 512), and not, like the Sanscrit and Greek, out of other tenses also, it has recourse to the passive participle *mahts*, *mahta*, *maht*, which, like the formal indicative preterite *mag*, has always a present signification,* on which account the temporal relation, if it be a past one, can be denoted only by the appended verb substantive, while

—

"the Gangâ (would) not be able (possible) to bring back by the wisher;" Hîdîmba, I 35, *kin tu śakyam mayâ kartum* "what, however, (is) to be able (possible) to do by me" (=what, however, can be done by me) Lassen (Hitôp II 75) remarks that constructions of this kind can in nowise be limited to *śak*, "to be able," but it is nevertheless certain that the construction of the active infinitive with the passive of a verb which signifies "to be able" is the most original and most deserving of special notice, for that verbs which signify "to begin" have in Sanscrit, as in other languages, a passive, is just as little surprising, as that the action which is begun is expressed in Sanscrit, as in German, by the active infinitive, as it is not necessary that the passive relation should be expressed both at the beginning and in the action which is begun, though constructions occur in Latin like *vasa conjici coepta sunt* (Nep); while we in German say, e.g., *das Haus wird zu bauen angefangen*, "the house is begun to build (to be built)," and in Sanscrit (Hit, ed Bonn p 49, l 10), *tēna vihārah kārayitum ārabdhah*, "by this one (would) a temple be begun to be built" It is self-evident that, in constructions of this kind, the action expressed by the infinitive does not stand in an active relation to the subject

* Cf Grimm, IV pp 59, 60

the Sanskrit *sakila* has already a past meaning both in and for itself. For the feminine *sakilā* mentioned above (p 1262 G ed Note) Ulphilas would have said *mahla* was not *mahla* *ist* while in Sanskrit if the usually [G Ed p 1261] omitted verb substantive were actually expressed in the passage quoted i.e. we should have *sakilā* *st* in the manner of the Latin periphrasis of the lost perfect passive as *amala* *est*. Though in Gothic also the circumlocutive for the passive infinitive by the participle preterite passive with the auxiliary verb to be (*waitthan*) already occurs (Grimm IV 57) and e.g. Matt viii 21 *καλυπτεσθαι* is rendered by *gahulith waitthan** nevertheless Ulphilas rejects this periphrasis in the cases in which in the Greek text the passive infinitive is dependent on a verb signifying to be able. Hence Mark xiv 5 *mahl* *iēst* *frabul* *yan* *ηδυνατο* *πραθῆναι*, Luke viii 13 *qrind* *ni mahla* (nom. fem.) *was fram* *ainōmēhun* *galeikindōn* *συνη* *οὐκ ἴσχυσε* *οὐ* *οὐδενος* *θεραπευθῆναι*. John iii 1 *hesia* *mahls* *ist* *manna* *ga* *bairan* *τὼς* *δυναται* *ἄνθρωπος* *γεννηθῆναι* x 30 *ni mahl* *ist* *galairan* *thala* *gameidō* *ou* *δυναται* *λυθῆναι* *η* *γραφῇ*, 1 Tim v 20 *filhan* *ni mahla* *sind* *krubḥai* *ou* *δυναται*.

871 Like *mahls* *skulds* (*skal* I must) also has the meaning of the present passive participle while in form it

* The preterite participle passive is well suited with the auxiliary verb "to be," for a periphrasis of the present infinitive because the auxiliary takes as it were the temporal power from the expression of the past, and places the past or perfect nature of the action in the future whereby the whole is by this means adopted to express the present. Compare the periphrasis for the future active in Old High Prussian by the perfect active participle and the auxiliary verb "to be" (see p 1061 Note). On the other hand the perfect passive participle with *isan* "esse" analogously to the Latin, expresses the perfect passive infinitive, and this is well worthy of notice. So in the subscription to 1 Cor, *m' lida* *isan* ("scripta esse"). Cf 2 Cor v 11 *sikunthans* *isan* "cojunctos esse" (π φα ερωσθαι) with iv 11 *sikuntha* *waitthai* (φαν ρωθῆ)

corresponds to the perfect passive participle of the Sanscrit and Latin. This *skulds* (fem *skulda*, neut *skuld*), receives

[G Ed. p 1265] in like manner the expression of the passive relation, which the language is incapable of expressing in the accompanying infinitive hence, e.g., Luke ix 41, *skulds ist atgiban in handuns mannē*, as it were, "he is being compelled to deliver into the hands of men," instead of, "he must be delivered" *μᾶλλον παροδίδωσθαι*). Moreover, in Gothic it often happens that it can be known only from the context and the accompanying dative (alone or with *fram*, "from"), which, in Gothic, frequently represents the Sanscrit instrumental, that the infinitive has not the common active meaning, but a passive one.* Thus, in Matt vi 1, it appears from the dative *im*, "by them," that the preceding infinitive has a passive signification, and that *du saihvan im*, which we, in order to imitate the construction, must translate by "to the seeing by them," translates the Greek *πρὸς τὸ θεαθῆναι αὐτοῖς*, where the infinitive has, through the prefixed article, the form of a concrete. Without, however, the *im*, which shews what is the proper meaning, *du saihvan*, "to see," for "seeing," could not well be otherwise taken in this passage than as active, and the preceding words, which lead us to expect a passive expression, would not justify us in taking the said infinitive as passive. Von Gabelentz and Lobe (Gramm p 140 c), remark, that, by a Germanism, the Gothic active infinitive after the verbs "to command, to will, to give" occurs with a passive signification. I cannot, however, perceive any passive signification of the infinitive in the examples adduced l c, except in *du ushiamyan*, "to crucify" (= "to the crucifying, to be crucified"). Among others, the following are cited as examples. Matt xxvii. 64, *hait vilan thamma hlava*, "command to watch the grave," exactly as,

* Cf the analogous Sanscrit constructions, p 1258 G. ed

in Latin *jube custodire sepulcrum*, only that [G Ed p 1266] the Gothic verb *rita* 'I watch' and therefore also its infinitive instead of the dative governs the accusative while the Latin *jubere* also admits of the passive infinitive as in the Greek text, *κελευσον ασφαλισθη̃ναι τοι ταφοι* (command the being watched with respect to the grave) Luke viii 53 *anabaud izaibiban* (dare not dare *δοθηναι*) *mat* 'He commanded to give her (*actionem dandi ei*) meat *jussit ei dare cibum* compared with the Greek *διεταξεν αυτη δοθ̃ναι φαγειν* 'He commanded the being given to her (*actionem τοῦ dari ei*) to eat (with reference to eating)' * a construction which cannot be imitated in Gothic but to which Ulfilas in Mark v 13 (*hahant izaibiban matyan*) thereby approximates in that he renders *φαγειν* by an infinitive which however here stands as the object of *giban* 'to give' in the common accusative relation and does not like the Greek express the relation 'in reference to' (as *προς ωκυς*) Most common is the representation of the Greek passive infinitive by the Gothic active infinitive with a passive signification to be deduced from the context in cases in which the infinitive expresses the causal relation and the Veda dialect uses the dative in *tu* or another infinitive form (see § 854) while the Gothic employs the infinitive with the preposition *du* or also the simple infinitive but the latter almost only after verbs of motion where it irrespective of its possible passive signification corresponds to the accusative of the Latin supine e.g. Luke v 15 *garunnun liuhmans managai hausyan* [G Ed p 1267] *yah leil inōn fram imma* 'great multitudes came together to him and to healing (=to be healed *θεραπευεσθαι*) by

* By this German rendering I merely wish to shew that the Greek passive infinitive stands in the accusative relation. The case-relation of the infinitive *φαγειν* is likewise accusative and corresponds to that of *τ φον* in the preceding example.

him," Luke 11 4, 5, *urian than yah iosef* . . . *anamilyan mith marun*, "and Joseph also went up to the taxing (to be taxed) with Mary," 2 Thess 1 10, *qumith ushauhyan*, "he cometh to the glorifying (to be glorified," ἐνδοξασθῆναι) But above (p. 1265 G. ed.), for *du saihnan*, "to the seeing (to be seen"), *saihnan* alone could scarcely stand, as no verb of motion precedes for the same reason, at Matt 26 2 also (*algibada du ushramyan*, "is betrayed to be crucified," εἰς τὸ σταυρωθῆναι), the preposition *du* could not be removed. On the other hand, the strictly active infinitive is occasionally also found in the causal relation without *du*, and without being preceded by a verb of motion, e g, Eph. vi. 19, *ei mis gibardau iaurd* . . . *kannyon runa anaggelyōns*, "that utterance may be given unto me . . . to make known the mystery of the gospel" (see Gabel and Lobe, Gramm p. 250)

875 In German, and indeed so early as in Old High German, the infinitive often apparently receives a passive signification through the preposition *zu* (Old High German, *za, ze, zi, zo, zu* With it, for the most part, is found the verb substantive, and we render the Latin future passive participle, when accompanied by the verb substantive, by the infinitive with *zu*, e g. *puniendus est* by "*er ist zu strafen*," "he is to punish" (i e "he is for the punishing fitted thereto") on the other hand, in English we have, "he is to be punished" (= "*er ist gestraft zu werden*") J Grimm, IV 60, 61, gives examples of the Old and Middle High German, from which I annex a few *ze karauenne sint* ("præparanda sunt"), Ker. 15^a, *ze kesezzenne ist* ("constituenda est"), Ker 15^b, *za pelōnne ist* [G Ed p 1268] ("orandum est"), Hymn 17 1, *ist zi firstandanne* ("intelligendum est"), Is 9 2, *daz er an ze sehene den fiouwen wære guot*, Nib 276 2 But even without the accompaniment of

• Regarding the dative form, see § 879

the verb substantive we give in appearance to the infinitive a passive signification in sentences like *er lässt nichts zu wünschen übrig* he leaves nothing to be desired, *er gab ihm Wein zu trinken* he gave him wine to drink. Such constructions answer to those in which in the Veda direct the dative of the infinitive stands apparently with a passive signification (see § 871) since *eg* ५१५ *pátavé* may very well be translated by to be drunk though it signifies nothing else than on account of drinking exactly like our *zu trinken* (*zum Trinken*) in the sentence cited above (cf pp 1225 1226 Note G ed). Our infinitives have also the appearance of a passive signification and the capacity of representing the real passive infinitives of other languages after *hören* to hear *sehen* to see *lassen* to leave *heissen* to be called *befehlen* to command in sentences like *ich höre erzählen* (*audio narrari*) *ich sah ihn mit Füssen treten* (*calcari*) I saw him trampled under foot *ich kann kein Thier schlachten sehen* (*mactari*) I cannot see an animal slaughtered *lass dich von ihm belehren* let thyself be taught by him, *er befahl ihn zu tödten* he ordered him to be slain (see Grimm IV 61). Yet when such expressions arose the want of a real passive infinitive was hardly felt and it was scarcely intended to give to the active infinitive a passive signification for the active meaning of the infinitive is here quite ample and in the cases in which an accusative is governed by the infinitive (*ich sah mit Füssen treten ihn* &c) it is even more natural than the passive. Undoubtedly in the sentences quoted above the infinitives are still more strictly active than the Sanscrit *netum* in the sentence previously (p 1258 G ed) discussed he is not deserving the summoning by my people because here there is no accusative governed by *netum* to summon which allows the active expression to appear in its full energy. The circum [G Fd p 1269] stance that many languages in such kinds of expression

arrive at the same method independently of each other, proves that it is very natural. I further recall attention, with J Grimm (1 c), to French sentences, such as, *je lui ai vu couper les jambes*, *il se laisse chasser*; and, moreover, to the fact, that in certain verbs the Latin admits both the active and passive infinitive, which, however, proves that the former is perfectly logical and correct, as it is not necessity, i. e. the actual want of a passive form, which occasions its use

876. As regards the form of the German infinitive, it appears to me beyond all doubt, that, as has already been elsewhere ("The Caucasian members of the Indo-European Family of Languages," p 83.) remarked, the termination *an*, afterwards *en*, is based on the Sanscrit neuter suffix *ana*, the formations of which in Sanscrit also very frequently supply the place of the infinitive,* and on which, too, are grounded also the Hindūstānī infinitives, as also the South Ossetish in *in*, the Tagaurish in *un*, and very probably, also, the Armenian, in the final *l* of which I think I recognise the very common corruption of an *n* (see § 20), as is the case, among other words, in *այլ ար*, "the other," compared with the Sanscrit *anya-s*, Latin *aliu-s*, Greek *ἄλλος*, and the Gothic base *alya* (see § 374) The vowel which precedes the *l* of the Armenian infinitives belongs, however, not to the suffix, but to the verbal theme, which we may learn from its changing according to the difference of the conjugations, hence, *e g բերել Եր-ե-լ*, "to carry,"† (Sanskrit [G Ed p 1270] *bhar-aná*, "the carrying, supporting")= Gothic *bau-a-n*, after the analogy of *բերել Եր-ե-մ*, "I bear,"

* See pp 1211, 1213, G ed

† I write the Armenian consonants in the Latin character, according to their parentage, and the pronunciation which is assigned to them by the order of the alphabet (see Petermann, p 16) The vowel *Է* *e*, which is often pronounced like *ye*, corresponds etymologically to the Greek *ε*, and, as the latter generally does, to the Sanscrit *a*

phlu ber e s thou bearest *uul ta l* to give (Sanskrit *dāna* the giving gift) with *uul ta m* I give *uul ta s* thou givest (Sanskrit *dadā mi dadā si*) *uul mn a l* to remain with *uul mn a-m* I remain *uul mn a s* thou remainest *uul mn a l* to die with *uul mn a s* thou diest In the German languages also the vowel preceding the final *n* of the infinitive does not belong to the infinitive suffix but to the class syllable In the weak conjugation (=Sanskrit Cl 10 see § 109 6) it is tolerably clear that *e g* the syllable *ya* of *satyan* to place (see § 741) the *a* of which according to an universal rule of sound (§ 67) is weakened before a final *s* and *th* to *i* is identical with the same syllable in *sat yu* I place *sat ya m* we place *sat ya nd* they place I therefore divide the infinitive thus *sat ya n* In forms like *salb o n* to solve (pres *salb o* *salb o s* *salb o th* &c) it is still more clear that the simple *n* is the suffix of the infinitive In Grimm's 3d conjugation of the weak form the *i* of the diphthong *ai* is dropped before the *n* of the infinitive as generally before nasals thus *hab a n* to have so too *hab a m* we have *hab a nd* they have contrasted with *hab ai s* thou hast *hab ai th* he has ye have on the other hand in Old High German *hab-ē n* to have as also *hab ē m* I have *hab-ē nt* they have In the strong verbs which with the few exceptions in *ya* (see § 109 2) belong to the Sanskrit 1st class it might have been before assumed that the *a* preceding the *n* in the infinitive is identical with the Sanskrit first *a* of the suffix *ana* that therefore *e g* *bair an* to bear *quiman* to come *bindan* to bind *betan* to bite *gretan* to weep correspond [G Ed p 1271] also with respect to the 1st *a* of the suffix to the Sanskrit neuter abstracts which are akin in formation *bhar ana* the bearing supporting *gam ana* the going *bandh ana* the binding *bhed ana* the separating *brand ana* the

weeping," and this was formerly my opinion. As, however, the verbs which correspond to the Sanscrit 4th class retain the character *ya* in the infinitive, and, *e g.*, the infinitive of *vahs-ya*, "I grow" (pret. *vôhs*), is *vahs-ya-n* (not *vahs-an*), and that of *bid-ya*, "I play" (pret *bath*, pl. *bêdum*), *bid-ya-n* (not *bid-an*), I now regard the *a* of forms like *bau-a-n*, *bind-a-n*, &c, as the class-vowel, and therefore as identical with that of *bair-a*, *bau-a-m*, *bau-a-nd*, *bind-a*, *bind-a-m*, *bind-a-nd*, and I derive in general the German infinitive from the theme of the special tenses, with which it always agrees in respect of the form of the radical vowel, since, *e g.*, *bind-a-n*, "to bind," *bug-an*, "to bend," correspond in this respect to the present *binda*, *buga*, but not to the true root *band*, *bug*, or to the singular of the preterite *band*, *baug* (plur *bundum*, *bugum*). Consequently the German infinitive stands in exact accordance with the Armenian, if I am right in viewing in the *l* of the latter the corruption of an *n*, and therefore in the before-mentioned *բերել ber-e-l*, a form exactly analogous to the Gothic *bau-a-n*, Old High German *bei-a-n*

Remark — As the Armenian *l e*, like the Greek *ε*, is the most common representative of the Sanscrit *a*, so the Armenian 1st conjugation, in the great majority of its verbs, viz in those which interpose a simple *l e* between the root and the personal terminations, corresponds to the Sanscrit 1st and 6th classes (see § 109^a 1), which two classes cannot be distinguished in Armenian, a language in which Guna is unknown. The inserted *l e*, therefore, of forms like *բերել ber-e-m*, "I bear," *բերես ber-e-s*, "thou bearest," *բերեմք ber-e-mkh*, "we [G Ed p 1272] bear," *բերեն ber-e-n*, "they bear," corresponds to the Greek *ε* of forms like *φέρ-ε-τε*, *φέρ-ε-τον*, *φέρ-ε-ς*, *φέρ-ε*, and to the Sanscrit *a* of forms like *bhā-a-si*, "thou bearest," *bhā-a-ti*, "he bears," *bhā-a-nti*, "they bear." The lengthening of the Armenian *l e* to *է é* in *բերէ ber-é*, "he bears," *բերէք ber-é-kh*, "ye bear," I regard as compensation for the dropping of the personal expression after the class-vowel,* for the *kh* of the last-named form is, to a

* As the 3d person *beré*, for *beret*=Sanskrit *bharati*, Gothic *bairith*, has

certain extent only the expression of plurality as in the 1st person *ber-e mkkh* (*mkkh*=Sanskrit *mas*) In the 2d person the *to be* presupposed *tkh* or *takh* like the Latin *tis* (*fertis*) would correspond rather to the Sanskrit dual (*bhar-a thas*) than to the plural (*bhar-a tha*) In the 1st Armenian conjugation occur also verbs, which odd, not a simple *e* but *ne* to the root in which it is easy to recognise as in the Latin *ni e g* in *ster ni-s ster ni t* (see § 496) the character of the Sanskrit 9th class, with *na ni* as class syllable Here belongs *e g*, the root [*wn* *charh* 'to mix, whence [*wn* *charh ne m* 'I mix infinitive [*wn* *charh ne l* The corresponding Sanskrit root *kar* (कृ *kri*), 'to s'rew with the preposition *sam*, also "to mix follows the 9th class not indeed in this signification but in another (to slay) and it admits of no doubt that the Armenian *charh ne m* corresponds to the Sanskrit *kri nā mi* (from *lar nā mi*) and Greek *κρ νη μι* Probably, also, the Armenian verbs in one *m* and one *m*—as *հարցաւմի՞ս* *harzonem* "I ask" (Sanskrit root *prachh*) *լուսաւմի՞ս* *loianam* "I wash" (Sanskrit root *plu* 'to swim causal "to wash Greek *πλ νω*—belong to the Sanskrit 9th class with the insertion therefore of an *a* between the root and the original class-character, in the same way as at times, in Old High German an *a* is prefixed to the formative suffixes beginning with a consonant (see § 793) Before the passive character which Petermann (p 188) [G Ed p 1273] aptly compares with the Sanskrit *ya*, verbs of this kind whether actually existing or presupposed drop the vowel of the class character In this manner at least I think that we must explain deponents like *մեռաւմի՞ս* *merhanum* I die for which we must suppose in Sanskrit *mri nā mi* (from *mar nā mi*) but not so as to identify the syllable *ni* of *merhanum* and similar forms with the *ni* which appears in Sanskrit before the heavy personal terminations (*yu ni mds* compared with *yu nā mi*) The Armenian 2d conjugation which adds *a* to the root as *e g* *ստաւմի՞ս* *orhs-a m* "I hunt would if this *a* were based like the *e* of the 1st conjugation on the syllable of insertion of the Sanskrit 1st and 6th class have retained

has lost a *t* I think too that in the ablative in *el* which Dr Wundischmann in his valuable academical treatise on the Armenian (p 28) calls a mysterious phenomenon we have to assume the dropping of a *t* and indeed the rather as the original final *t* has become unendurable in many Indo-European languages Hence the Armenian ablatives like *human e* from the base *human* may be compared with the Zend like *chashman at* (see p 197) and the *te* for *te* may be viewed as a compensation for the dropping of the *t*

the character of its Indian prototype still more truly than the 1st conjugation. As, however, the Armenian *u a* more frequently corresponds to the Sanscrit long *ā* than to the short, it would also be possible that the *u a* under discussion, like the Latin *ā* of the 1st conjugation, with which Fr Windischmann compares it,* is based on the Sanscrit *aya* of the 10th class (see § 109^a 6). The circumstance, however, that the Armenian *a*-conjugation contains many neuter verbs, while the Sanscrit *aya* is principally devoted to the formation of causal and denominative verbs, makes the deduction of the Armenian 2d conjugation from the Sanscrit 10th class little probable, and favours rather the derivation from the 1st or 6th class, or from the 4th, containing scarce any but neuter verbs, which in Armenian might easily have sacrificed the semi-vowel of their character *ya* (cf Petermann, p 188). In the Armenian 3d conjugation there are many verbs which add *nu* to the root, and thereby at once remind us of the Sanscrit *nu* of the 5th class (see § 109^a 4), with which Petermann also has compared them. Those which add a simple *u* have probably, like the Sanscrit verbs of the 8th class, lost an *n* (see §. 495.)

877 The Hindūstānī infinitive also has dropped the first vowel of the Sanscrit suffix *ana*,† and, on the other hand,

* “Foundation of the Armenian in the Arian Family of Languages,” in the treatises of the 1st class of the Bavarian Academy of Lit, B IV. Part I, in the special impression, p 44

† The *ā* by which transitives like *jöl-ā-nā*, “*urere*,” is formed from intransitives like *jöl-nā*, “*ardere*,” I derive from the Sanscrit causal character *aya*, in the same way as the Latin *ā* of the 1st conjugation (§ 109^a 6). By this *a* causatives also are formed from active transitives, e g, *bīdh-ā-nā*, “to cause to bore,” from *bēdh-nā*, “to bore” (= Sanscrit *bhēd-ana-m*, “the cleaving,” root *bhid*, (Gilchrist, “A Grammar,” &c, p 147). With regard to the causal here exhibiting a weaker vowel than the primitive verb, while in Sanscrit the causals usually experience an increment to the vowel, it is probable that the Hindūstānī finds a reason for weakening the radical syllable in the incumbance of the causal by the affix *ā*. Where, however, the causal or transitive loses the proper causal character, it often exhibits a stronger vowel than the primitive; e g

¹ Shakespear, with more probability, compares the word वेधन *vedhan* from व्यध *vyadh*, “to pierce.” In the original, Professor Bopp writes *bīd-ā-nā* and *bēd-nā*, which do not occur in our dictionaries — *Translator*

lengthened the final *a* in case we are not to [G Ed p 1274] suppose that it is derived from the feminine form of the suffix *अन* *ana* which is used in Sanscrit for the formation of abstract substantives much more rarely than the neuter. The following are examples *आसना* *asana* the sitting *युचन* *yuchanā* the request, *वन्दन* *vandanā* the praising. Herewith agree in respect of accentuation [G Ed p 1275] also the Greek *αωνη* and *ηδοιη* while *αρχωνη* and *δαμναιη* in this latter respect differ but the latter has retained the Old *a* sound of the suffix. To this head too have

मार ना to slay (Sanskrit *mārāyāmi* "I make to die") from *mār nā*⁽¹⁾ "to die" (=Sanskrit *मृ* *m r nā*=*मरण* *marana*, 'the dying')—In the *w* of Hindustani causals like *चोल वाना* to make to go (*चोल नः* 'to go') I recognise a corruption of the *p* of the causals like *जव अप आय म* discussed above (§ 749). The transition of the *p* into *w* appears, however to have taken place at a time when one more vowel preceded the labial as *e g*, in the numerals *एकान* *n 51* *बावन* *52* *सत्तवन* *57* in contradistinction to *तुपडन* *3* *पडप* *n 55* where it admits of no doubt that both *u n* end *pon* are based on the Sanskrit *pañchasat* *50* and therefore *एकान* on *ekapañchasat* *tupon* on *tripañchasat* the nasal of which is lost in the Hindustani *pochas* *50* while the simple *پانچ* *pañch* has retained it. The length of the *a* of *پانچ* *pañch* compared with the Sanskrit short vowel may perhaps serve as a compensation for the dropping of the syllable *an* (*pañchan*) for short *ā* appears in Hindustani regularly as short *o* which Gilchrist according to English pronunciation writes *u*. The Hindustani is most extremely sensitive with regard to the weight of the vowel, and therefore weakens the long *ā* of *pañch* again to *o* when the overloading the word by composition gives occasion for this *e g* in *pondroh* *15* thus *sotroh* *17* opposed to *sat* (from *saptan*) *7*.

(1) The vowel here given as *o* by Professor Bopp is undoubtedly *u* and the word *मार* is universally written *marā*. More than that the sound *o* does not exist in the language except before *r* any more than it does in Marathi as has been noticed before. It is true that in Bengali short *u* is pronounced like *o* and hence Dr Carey has imagined this to be the case in Marathi but there is no foundation for such a belief.—Translator

already been referred (§ 803. sub f), as conjectural cognate forms, the Old High German abstracts in *unga*, while those in New High German have lost their final vowel. It does not, however, appear probable to me, that the Hindūstānī infinitives are based on these feminine abstracts, but I regard their *ā* as the lengthening of the Sanscrit short *a*, which in general, in Hindūstānī, when final, is either entirely suppressed or lengthened, the latter, among other words, in the names of male animals, while those of females terminate in *i*, and the generic name has lost the original final vowel (see Gilchrist "A Grammar," &c, p. 52). Thus, *e.g.*, the general term for the buffalo (Sanskrit *mahisha*) in Hindūstānī is *ماہیش* *māhiṣ*, while the male buffalo is *māhiḷā*, and the female *māhiḷi*, the latter = Sanskrit *mahishī* (see § 119). As the Hindūstānī has lost its neuter, the Sanscrit neuters, which in their theme are not to be distinguished from masculine bases, have in the said language become masculines, and we may therefore unhesitatingly compare the Hindūstānī infinitives in *ū nā* with the Sanscrit abstracts in *ana*, thus, *e.g.*, *jōl-nā*, "to burn" = Sanskrit *jalanā-m*, "the burning," or rather = *jalanā-s*, as the Sanscrit neuters have, in Hindūstānī become masculines. The oblique case in *ē* of the Hindūstānī infinitive points to a Sanscrit base in *a*, in which we easily recognise the Sanscrit locative of bases in *a* (see § 196) therefore, *e.g.*, in *jōlnē*, "to burn," | we perceive the Sanscrit *jalanē*, "in the burning"

* The common term for a male buffalo in Hindūstānī is *بھنسا* *bhansā*, and for a female *بھنس* *bhans*, and in Marāṭhī, *म्हैसा* *mhaṣā* and *म्हैस* *mhaṣ* *ماہیش* *māhiṣ*, in which a mere provincial pronunciation changes *sh* to *k*, is comparatively seldom used — *Translator*

† This form in *ē* usually expresses in the Hindūstānī infinitive the accusative relation, as is also occasionally the case in Sanscrit. I recall attention to the passage of the Rāmāyana cited above (§ 852.), in which *grahanē*

878 The dropping of the final *a* of the [G Fd p 126]
Sanskrit neuter suffix *ana* in the German infinitives accords

grahan 'to take to receive' is governed by *sekur* (euphonic for *sehus*)
they could So in Hindustani, in an example given by Yates (In
troduction &c p 65) *main bolnē nahin sukta* I cannot say I to
say (in the saying for the saying acc) not being able Where how
ever the infinitive stands in the nominative relation as *sunna* 'to hear
(the hearing)' in the example given by Yates I c 'hearing is not like
seeing' we find the form in *na* As the adjectives also the participles
included end in the masculine singular nominative in *i* I regard the
lengthening of the originally short *a* as a compensation for the suppressed
case sign, and I therefore derive *a* from *a s* just as in Marathi In the
masculine plural nominative of both languages the termination *ē* corre
sponds to the Sanskrit pronominal declension (see § 228) hence in Hin
dustani *main martē* I strike properly I (em) striking fem
main marti I (am)striking pl *hom martē* we (are)striking Com
pare *iē* they (pl) which belongs either to the Zend and Old Persian
base *aia* or as is more probable to the Sanskrit reflexive base *aiā*
(§ 341) on which also the Old Persian *hūa* (euphonic for *hīa*) he
is based and from which we might have expected a masculine plural
nominative *ai* The Sanskrit diphthong *ē* plays throughout an important
part in Hindustani Grammar and thus we find also in the subjunctive
forms like *tu mare* thou mayest strike *iqh marē* he may strike
hom mar n "we may strike *iē marēn* they may strike a good rem
nant of Sanskrit Grammar since the *e* of those forms is evidently based
on that of the Sanskrit potential of the 1st principal conjugation and
indeed so that the final *s* and *t* of the 2d and 3d person singular have
been lost (thus *mare* for *māre s* and *marē t* cf *bhārē s bhārē t* p 946)
and of the termination *ma* of the 1st person plural only the *m* has been
left in the form of a weakened nasal thus *marē n* for *m rē ma* or *mo*
in the 3d person plural we have *mare n* for *mārē nt* (see § 402 p 645)
which approximates very closely to the Old High German forms like
berē n ferant On the Sanskrit potential also is based in my opinion
the Hindustani future just like the Latin of the 3d and 4th conjugations
(according to § 692) only that in Hindustani to the subjunctive men
tioned above where it represents the future indicative a syllable has been
added in which I recognise the above mentioned (p 1104 Noto †) San
skrit enclitic *ha* Ved also *gha* or *gha* which however in Hindustani
1 L 2 just

[G Ed p.1277] with the phenomenon, that, in general, neuter bases in *a* have lost this vowel in the nominative

just as in *Afghān*, has become declinable (see Preface to the 5th Part, p viii⁽¹⁾), and also distinguishes the genders, hence, *c g*,

uṣṭh mārī-ḥ-gā, "he will strike;"

uṣṭh mārī-ḥ-gī, "she will strike,"

hōm mārīn-gē, "they will strike"

After

⁽¹⁾ The Preface here referred to is as follows:—"I have, in the part now laid before the public, not yet been able to finish my Comparative Grammar, but give here preliminarily the conclusion of the formation of moods, the locative of the derivative adverbs, and a part of the formation of words, viz the formation of participles, and of those substantives and adjectives which stand in close connection with any participle through the derivative suffix. Since the publication of the 4th Part of this book, Comparative Grammar has acquired a new region for research in Sanscrit accentuation which hitherto had remained almost unknown, and which Böhtlingk's academical treatise, "A first attempt regarding the accent in Sanscrit," opened out to us ^(a) Anficcht, in his pamphlet, "De accentu compositorum Sanscriticorum" (Bonn, 1847), treats of the accentuation of compounds. Benfey and G. Curtius have been the first to draw attention to detached instances of agreement between the Sanscrit and Greek accentuation, the former in his notice of Böhtlingk's treatise (Halle Journal of General Literature, May 1845), the latter in his brochure, "The Comparison of Languages in their relation to Classical Philosophy" (2d Ed pp 22, 23, 61). I believe I recognise a common fundamental principle in the system of accentuation in both languages in this, that in Sanscrit, as well as in Greek, the

^(a) Some very valuable corrections, which have since been confirmed by the accentuated Vêda-text, are given by Holtzmann in his brochure "On the Ablaut" (Carlsruhe, 1844), p 9. Thus Holtzmann has been the first to shew, or rather to understand rightly, the rule of Pāṇini on this head, concealed in an obscure, technical language, that the plural of *bódhāma* is not accented *bó-dhāmás* but *bódhāmas*, that of *dvīshma* not *dvīshmas* but *dvīshmás*. Hence it is clear that the division of the personal terminations in § 480 into heavy and light, is also of importance for the theory of accentuation, and that the heavy terminations here, too, principally act on the next preceding syllable, since they can remove from it its accent as well as the Guna.

accusative singular together with the case sign. As therefore e.g., the Gothic base word *daura* 'door' con

After what has been said, it hardly need be remarked that the Hindūstani imperative also, in most persons of both numbers is identical with the Sanscrit potential and the corresponding moods in the cognate European languages so that therefore e.g., *māre* 'let him strike' for *māre t* corresponds to the Old High German forms like *lære* 'let him carry

the accenting of the beginning of a word or the throwing back of the accent as far as possible is considered the most emphatic, and that which imparts the greatest animation to the whole word (see p 1084 C ed 1000 E Tr). Hence follows a very pervading though hitherto almost overlooked agreement of the two languages in the accentuation of that part of speech which is formally and significantly the richest viz the verb (see p 1086 G ed 1004 E Tr). A most convincing proof of the emphasis given by accenting the first syllable is furnished by the Sanscrit in this, that it withdraws this species of accent from the passive but allows it to the middle of the fourth class though in sound the two forms are identical, thus, *suchyatē purificatur* compared with *suchyat purificat* it also deserves especial notice with reference to this point that the oxytone nouns of a-neya in *tār* (nom *ta*) when they are found as participles governing the accusative, and therefore to use an expression employed by Chinese Grammarians are changed from dead words to living ones then receive also the most animated accentuation hence e.g. *dātā maghan* 'he is giving riches' opposed to *dātā maghanām* 'the giver of riches' (see § 814). A similar contrast it to be found in the Greek paroxytone abstracts in *ros* as compared with the verbals in *ros* which correspond to the Sanscrit perfect passive participle e.g., *προς* 'the drinking' opposed to *πότης*=Sanskrit *pītās* 'drunk' (see § 817). The two languages when they accent the suffix in the case before us do not intend to lay an emphasis on the suffix, but rather to remove from the whole word the emphasis which lies in accenting the first syllable. In accordance with the theory here laid down is also the circumstance that the Greek gives the paroxytone accent to the interrogative *τίς* upon the number of its syllables being increased as in a question there is an increase of animation which we also mark by raising the voice while it oxytonises the indefinite pronoun of the same sound in agreement with the Sanscrit weak cases of monosyllabic base words (see p 1085 G ed, 1003 E Tr). I cannot allow of a
logical

trasts with the Sanscrit nominative accusative *dhāra-m* [G Ed p 1278] the form *dau*; so instead of the Sanscrit

carry," the Gothic like *banai*, and Greek like *φέποι*. But in the 1st person singular *mārūn*, "let me strike" (at once future and subjunctive), I think I recognise the Sanscrit imperative termination *ān*, with *ū* therefore for *ā*, as above (p 1215 G ed) in the Marāṭha present. The Hindūstānī fails to distinguish the Sanscrit terminations *ān* and *ān*, as both have

logical accent either to the Sanscrit (in simple words), nor to the Greek,⁽¹⁾ and I cannot see a reason for the proparoxytonising of *bódhām*, 'I know,' *bódhāmas*, 'we know,' and the oxytonising of *imās*, 'we go' (in disadvantageous contrast to *ἴμεν*), in this, that in the first-named forms the radical syllable, and in the latter the personal syllable, should be brought prominently forward as the most important, but I think it rather owing to the fact that the most animated accent belongs to the verb, but of this the form *imās* is, as it were, cheated through the influence which, in Sanscrit, in disadvantageous contrast to the Greek, the heavier personal terminations exercise, in certain conjugational classes, on the removal of the accent. In forms like *śtūnōmi*, 'I strew,' *yunāmi*, 'I bind,' the length of the last syllable but one has, in disadvantageous contrast to the analogous Greek forms (*στέρνυμι*, *δάμνυμι*) exercised a similar influence in attracting the accent as that which a long penultima exercises in Latin in words of three or more syllables (see p 1090 G ed, p 1057 E Tr), while in Greek it is only in the first syllable that the quantity has gained a disturbing influence on the original accentuation, so that, *ε γ*, *ἡδείων* stands in disadvantageous contrast when compared alike with the Sanscrit *svādīyān* (see p 1091 G ed, p 1058 E Tr), and with its own neuter *ἡδιον*, as in the dual of the imperative *φεπέων*, compared with the Sanscrit *bhāratām*, and the 2d person *φέπερον* (=Sans *bhāratam*).

"Besides the Greek, no other European member of our great lingual family has remained constant to the old system of accentuation, in which the accent forms an essential part of grammar, and does its part in aiding to decide the grammatical categories. In Latin the kind of accentuation, which

(¹) Benlow is of a different opinion, who, in his work, "De l'accentuation des langues Indo-Européennes" (Paris, 1847), p 44, "En Sanscrit l'accent a une signification purement logique, et il porte sur toute syllable que la pensée veut mettre en évidence et faire ressortir du reste du mot, quelle que soit sa distance du commencement ou de la fin de celui-ci."

bandhana m the binding" we may expect in Gothic only
bindan m With the dative *ययाम्* *ban bandhya* should be

have lost the final *i* and *ri* like *n* at the end of the word, has become *rausvuri* (*n*). With respect to the *us* of the 1st person singular of the imperative in the *s* use of the future I would draw attention to a similar *us* in *Zenl* (*se t^{er} sub f*). In the 3d person plural the form *marc* "we strike" or "we may strike" (*marc-γ^s* "we will strike") occasions a difficulty

which in Sanscrit and Greek is the most emphatic, viz the farthest possible enclitic, of the accent has become under certain known restrictions, universal and therefore the accent here is no more of service in Grammar and where forms like *tuus et tuus estis* exhibit an external agreement in respect to accent with the Sanscrit *atd meṣ aditā rī / antī* the coincidence is so far from being the reason of the accentuation is different in the two languages. So also among other words the agreement in the accentuation of *distrem* with *distrem* and *dompa* is accidental since the Latin does not accent the suffix because the accent belongs to it from old time but because the last syllable *at* or *ie* is long. Remarkable, if not resting on affinity is the agreement of the Latin system of accentuation with the Arabian. The latter in word of two and three syllables accents the first in polysyllables the third but so that as in Latin a length of vowel or of position in the last syllable but one draws the accent to that syllable while a long final syllable has no influence in removing the accent thus *egilite* he slew / *tal* they slew contrasted with *latite* 'thou sleepest' *nicht* / *n* sleep / *itilna* the slaying. (1) In Lithuanian perhaps some isolated remnants of the old accentuation occur. Much information however cannot be gleaned from the grammars and lexicon which seldom mark the accented syllable. I preliminarily draw attention to the agreement which the adjective bases in *u* present with the Sanscrit and Greek in *u* since they likewise accent this vowel hence *egallus* sweet as in Sanscrit *svetus* (see § 20) in Greek *ἡδυσ* 'holl' as in Greek *ὀψος*. The throwing back of the accent too which occasionally occurs in the vocative of the dual compare *et* with the nominative of the same sound is also deserving of notice *eg* in *grunū* compared with the nominative *geriponē*, 'two good masters' (Mielcke p. 46). The vocative of *svietis* *dingu* 'two light heavens', is left by Mielcke unmarked (*svietis dingu*) probably because it is not oxytone but paroxytone. In Sanscrit according

contrasted, in Gothic, according to §. 356. Rem. 3, *bindana*; and we should have looked for forms of this kind after the

difficulty on account of its final *o*. For it the Marāthī exhibits in the imperative the form *mārā*, which I think may be explained from Sanscrit forms like *bōdhi-a-ta*, "know ye," so that, after dropping the *t*, the two *a*-sounds have coalesced, as I also, in the 3d person singular of the present, derive *वेच्छेच्छे* *vechhē*, "he wishes," from the Sanscrit *vechh-ā-ti*, by casting out the *t*, and contracting the *a-i* to *ē*, according to Sanscrit rules Cf Greek

to a fixed rule, *sūnū*, 'two sons' (Lithuanian *sund*), forms the vocative *sūnū* (see p 1086 G ed, 1054 E Tr) At the end of the next Part I shall have much to supply regarding Sanscrit accentuation, for in the remark at § 785 I would not go back to all the former parts of the Grammar, but only lay down the fundamental principle, on which the most remarkable agreements between the Sanscrit and Greek accentuation rest, and at the same time draw attention to the grounds which have occasioned one or other of the said languages to diverge from the original path, in which, in my opinion, the Sanscrit and Greek meet I shall also have some supplementary remarks to offer on some points of grammar and the doctrine of sounds, as I have already, in the present Part, pointed out some alterations in former views In addition to what has been remarked at p 1138 Rem * G ed, p 1104 Note † E Tr, regarding the *ch* of our pronominal accusatives *mi ch*, *di-ch*, *si ch*, and the Old High German *h* of the accusative plural *uns-i-h*, *wir-h*, I have since found a very interesting analogy in the Afghān, where, however, the *h* referred to, which I think I recognise in *hagha*, 'the, this,' as sister-form of the Sanscrit *sāha*, Vêdic *sāgha* or *sāghā*, Greek *σῆγε*, has become declinable, hence, in the plural, *haghū*, and in the feminine singular nominative, *haghē*, the latter like *dē*, 'she,' contrasted with the masculine *da*, 'he,' being a softening of the Sanscrit base *ta* In the syllable *ga*, too, of *māṅga*,^(a) 'we,' I think I recognise the said particle, and in the remaining part of the word the Sanscrit accusative *asmān* *ἡμᾶς*, with the loss of the first syllable, which is also dropped in the New Persian *mā*, 'we,' which, just like *shumā*, 'ye,' is based on the theme of the Sanscrit oblique plural cases (*yushmān*, *īmās*)"

^(a)J Ewald, in the "Journal of Eastern Intelligence," IV 300 Klaproth "Asia, Polygl" p 56, writes *mongha*

preposition *du*² to which governs the dative but we find in this position also only the form in *an c g du sairan* to sow *du bairan* to give birth to, whether it be that the preposition *du* originally governed the accusative like the Latin *ad* of cognate meaning and the infinitive at this more ancient epoch remained unchanged or that it had lost its capability of declension in Gothic earlier than in the other German dialects.

879 In the Old and Middle High German as also in the Old Anglo Saxon dative of the infinitive the doubling of the *n* is surprising * yet I cannot thereby see cause to derive the datives and the analogous [G Id p 127⁹] genitives of the Old and Middle High German† from another base than that of the nominative accusative of the infinitive and to see in it a different suffix from the

Greek forms like *φ πες* from *φερ-ε n*=Sanskrit *bhīr-a ti* (see § 140) In the 2d person the form *ἰσχήης* *ischēēs*=*ischēl ai* compared with the Sanskrit *ischēh d si* is formed in my opinion by transposition just as in Greek *φ πες* from *φερ-ε ai*=Sanskrit *bhīr a si* (see § 148) So also in the 3d person plural *ἰσχήēt* from *ischēh anti* with at the same time rejection of the *n* If the Morāthi can be held to throw light on the Hindustani which closely resembles it we might regard the *ō* of Hindustani forms like *marō*, 'beat ye' as the corruption of *d* just as in Sanskrit *सुलो लसान* *ś'lo lasan* 16 for *śhu lasan*, *sōllum* to carry, for *sādhum* (see Abridged Sanskrit Grammar §§ 102 2⁹⁸ Rem 1)

* See the examples mentioned above (§ 87.) Old Saxon examples are *faranne blidzeanne thlōnne* Anglo Saxon, *faranne ricenne gefrem manne* see Grimm I 10⁹¹ In Gothic the form *uiganna* (*du uiganna* *ε τωλεμ*, Luke xiv 31) even though not an infinitive would be remarkable on account of the doubled *n* if the reading were correct It is most highly probable however that we ought to read *uigana* (see Gal el and Löbe on l c) The word belongs however in respect of its suffix of formation to the Sanskrit class of words in *ana*, and is probably a nenter therefore nominative accusative *vigan*

† *E g* Old High German *toponnes* of roging Middle High German *wimennes* of weeping

Sanskrit *ana*, of which we have just treated I hold the doubling of the *n* to be simply euphonic, *i e* a consequence of the inclination for doubling *n* between two vowels, hence, also, *e g*, in Old High German *kunni* (or *chunni*), in Old Slavonic *kunm*, in Middle High German *kunne*, corresponds to the Gothic *kun*, "sex" The word is radically akin to the Greek γένος, Latin *genus*, and Vêdic *jānus* (gen *jānush-as*), "buth," and its formative suffix is *ya* (dat pl. *ya-m*), which is contracted in the nominative accusative singular to *i* (see § 153) It is impossible, however, that the doubling of the *n* in this *kunm*, *kunne*, &c, should give occasion to those forms to assume a different formative suffix from *ya*, of which more hereafter *

880 The original destination of the preposition *zu*, "to," before the infinitive, is to express the causal relation, which is done in the Vêda dialect by the simple dative termination of the infinitive base in *tu*, or of some other abstract substantive supplying the place of the infinitive, and for which, in classical Sanscrit, the locative of the form in *ana* is also frequently employed, as, in general, the locative in Sanscrit is very often used for the dative The Gothic, in its use of the infinitive with *du*, keeps almost entirely to the stated fundamental destination of this kind of construction, in sen-

[G Ed p 1280] tences like "he went out to sow" (*du sarian*), "he that hath ears to hear" (*du hausyan*), "who made ready to betray him" *du galévyan ina*) It is, however, surprising that Ulfilas too at times expresses the nominative relation by the prepositional infinitive, *e g*, 2 Cor ix. 1, τὸ γράφειν

* That the Gothic, also, is not free from the inclination to double the *n* between two vowels is shewn by forms like *uf-munman*, "to think," *ufu-munnôn*, "to forget" (Sanskrit *man*, "to think"); *kunnu-s*, "jaw-bones" = Greek γένυ-ς, Sanskrit *hanû-s* In Sanscrit the final *n* after a short vowel, in case the word following begins with any vowel whatever, is regularly doubled, *e g*, *āsann iha*, "they were here"

by *du mēljan* * Philip 1 24 *το μειειν* by *du visan* It is possible even for the nominative neuter of the article to precede the infinitive with *du*, thus Mark vii 33 *thata du friyon ina* (το αγαπᾶν αυτοι) *thata du friyon nehvundyan* (το αγαπᾶν τον πλησιον) Usually however Ulfilas translates the Greek nominative of the infinitive by the simple infinitive and indeed without the article even where the Greek text has the article as e.g. Gal iv 19 *aththan goth ist alyanþn in gōdam ma sinteiwo* (καλον δε το ζηλούτθαι εν καλω παιτοτε) Philip 1 21 *aththan mis liban Christus ist yah gasiullan ga vaurtli* (εμοι γαρ το ζην Χριστος και το αποθανεῖν κερδος)

881 Where the infinitive is the object of a verb governing the accusative the Gothic translation of the Bible exhibits almost universally the simple infinitive so that constructions like he began or he commenced to go to which to a certain extent analogous forms occur so early as in Sanscrit (see pp 1211 1212 G ed) are still tolerably remote from Gothic Where however Ulfilas in Luke iv 10 renders *εντελειται τοῦ διαφυλαξαι σε* by *anabiudith du gīfas tan thu* he wished here probably to approximate more closely to the Greek text and to paraphrase the genitive of the infinitive which is wanting in Gothic by the preposition *du* or to fill out with that preposition the place which is occupied in the original text by the genitive of the article since he elsewhere expresses the object of the verbs which signify to command to order by [G Ed p 1281] the simple accusative of the infinitive e.g. Luke viii 31 *anabudi galeithan επιταξη απελθειν*

882 In the use of the Gothic infinitive those constructions merit especial attention in which an accusative accompanies the infinitive which is governed as the case of

* *Ufyo mis ist du mēljan i vis* it is superfluous for me to write to you (=the writing)

the object, neither by the verb nor by the infinitive, but which, as in the Greek text, expresses the relation "in respect of," which relation is very frequently denoted by the Greek accusative (πόδας ὠκύς, ὄμματα καλός), but is strange to the Gothic, except in the construction with the infinitive. I regard the infinitive in such sentences in both languages as the subject, and therefore as nominative, and the verb, not as Gabelentz and Lobe do (Gram p 249, 5.), as impersonal, though we might translate it by "it happened, it befel, it became," &c, but just as much personal as when we, *e g*, say, "to sit is more pleasant than to stand," "the rising up is seasonable, is now becoming," "to enter is easy" That which is peculiar in the Greek and Gothic constructions referred to is only that the infinitive cannot, like an ordinary abstract, govern the genitive, that therefore, in Greek, *e g*, it cannot be said, τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ τῆς γῆς παρελθεῖν, nor in Gothic *himins jah airthós hundarleithan*, but that in both languages the person or thing to which the action which is expressed by the infinitive refers, must be placed in the accusative, since the infinitive admits not of the nearer destination either by an adjective or by a genitive, not even there where the Greek infinitive, by prefixing the article, is made more of a substantive than of itself it is Of the examples collected by Gabel and Lobe, 1 c, the first, *varth afslauthann allans* (Luke iv 36), must appear the most surprising, since the

[G Ed p 1282] Greek text (ἐγένετο θάμβος ἐπὶ πάντας) furnishes no motive for a construction unusual in Gothic In fact, the Gothic translation would appear very forced if *varth* here correspond in sense to our *vaird*, so that it would be requisite to translate literally, "there was amazement (with reference to) all," or "amazement was (with reference to) all" As, however, the Gothic *vairthan*, as the said learned men have shewn in their Glossary, also

signifies "to come" * I here take *allims* as the accusative governed by a verb of motion (which too, the Greek *ερχετο* in this passage is) and I translate literally "there came amazeinēt (over) all" or "amazeinēt fell upon all" Moreover in another quite similar passage Ulfilas finds it suitable to translate the Greek *επι-αντας* by *ana allaim* viz Luke i 66 *yah earth ana allaim agis* (και *ερχετο επι-αντας φοβος*) and there came fear upon all" It would therefore be wrong in this passage to translate *earth* by *factus est* Of the Gothic examples, therefore collected by Gabelentz and Lobe † of the infinitive with the accusative let us dispense with the 1st which has just been discussed and also with the 5th (John xviii 15) because in it the Gothic construction differs from the Greek in that as I doubt not the accusative *aimana mannan* is governed as the objective case by the transitive infinitive *fragaityan* "to destroy to slay" ‡ so that we have only four examples left which belong here These are Col i 19 in *nama gahiskauli alla fullōn bauan* (εν αυτω ευδοκησε τοις το πληρωμα) "it pleased the dwelling in him (in respect of) all fulness (of all fulness)" Luke xvi 17 *ith a etla ist himin yah airtha hundarleithan than eitwis aimana irit gadruisan* (ευκοτωτερον δε εστι τον ουραισι και της γηι παρελθειν η του ιουμου μισι κεραιαν τρεειν) "but it is easier to pass away (the passing away) with respect to heaven and earth (= of heaven and earth) than to fall (the falling) with reference to one tittle of the law" Rom xiii 11 *mel ist uns yu us sl pa urteisan* § (ωρα ημας ηδη εξ υπιου ερχεσθηναι) "It is time (in

* Remark the connection of the Gothic root *gart* with the Sanscrit root *gart* *ir* "to go, and the Latin *certo* (see Pott L I I 211)

† Gmhm p 219 5

‡ "It is better to put one man to death for the people"

§ This passage is in Gothic, so far ambiguous, that *uns* may be both dative and accusative, especially as the dative more frequently occurs in constructions

reference to) for us now to rise (the rising) from sleep," Skeir (ed. Massmann, p 38 10), *gadh nu vas thanzuh . gaqvissans varthan*, "it were therefore fitting, in respect of this (the) being agreeing" It becomes a question, then, is this kind of construction as it were indigenous in the Gothic, or only an imitation of the Greek? I believe the latter, and, indeed, because in Gothic the accusative elsewhere never expresses the relation "in respect of." Moreover, Ulfilas gladly avoids this kind of construction, as he shews, by frequently changing the infinitive construction of the original text into a verbal with the conjugation *ei*, "that," or by using, instead of the accusative of the person, the dative, whether the relation be the proper dative one or the instrumental. In the latter case he follows, indeed, the Greek text word by word, but, by the change of the accusative into a dative, the construction [G Ed p 1284] becomes essentially altered, and such that we, in New High German, also can, without much constraint, imitate it. *e g*, Luke xviii 25, *mathzô allis ist ulbandau tharrh thankô néthlôs tharrhleithan thau gabigamma in thiudangardya guths galeithun* (κύκλω τρον γάρ ἐστι κάμηλον . *ciscλθcîn &c*), "for it is easier for the camel (the) passing through the eye of a needle, than for the rich (the) entering into the kingdom of God," Luke xvi 22, *varth than gasviltan thamma unlêdin* (ἐγένετο δὲ ἀποθανεῖν τὸν πτωχόν), "there was, however, dying through the poor man," Luke vi 1, *varth gaggan imma tharrh atisk* (ἐγένετο διαπορεύεσθαι αὐτὸν διὰ τῶν σπορίμων), "there was going through him through the corn-field" On the other hand, the Greek

constructions in which the Greek text exhibits the accusative with the infinitive

* As regards the example in the Skeneins, I must recall attention to the fact, that these were hardly composed originally in Gothic, but most probably were translated from the Greek

text too 1 Cor vii 26 has the dative καλοὶ αἰθρωπῶ το οὕτως εἶναι ὅλλη ἰστ ἡσπυ εἰα ἰσαν good is it for a man so to be" So Mark ix 12 καλὸν ἐστὶ σοὶ εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν ζωὴν ἡλωοὶ ἢ τοὺς δύο ποσας ἔχοντα βληθῆναι εἰς τὴν ἰειοῖαι ὅλλη thus ἰστ ḡalethan in libam hallamma ἡσπυ ἰσπυ ḡḡas habandin ḡaiairan in ḡaiainnan better (good) is it for thee to go into life lame (for thee lame) than having two feet (for thee having) to erst (the erstung = to be erst) into hell * Ulfilas employs the periphrasis by εἰ that e.g. 1 Ph i 1 εἰ σιγαῖμα εἰς εἰρηὴν ὕαḡ ἡπιαμῖναι (εἰαὶ ἡμας αἰουε καὶ ἀμωμους) that we should be holy and without blame iv 2^o εἰ ἀσφαγὰθ ὕμυ ἡαυα ḡairnyan ἡαḡḡḡḡḡḡ (ἀποθεσθαι ὕμας τοὶ -αλαιοὶ αἰθρω-οὶ).

653 When the accusative of the person [C 11 p 12^s] in like manner as that of the infinitive is governed by the verb the case is different from that of the constructions imitative of the Greek which have been noticed in the preceding paragraph and in which the accusative of the person expresses only a secondary relation which we must paraphrase by in reference to or touching At least I do not believe that sentences like *Ich sah ihn fallen* I saw him fall *Ich horte ihn singen* I heard him sing *Ich liess ihn gehen*

I bade him go last much ḡel'en let me go" analogous cases to which occur in Sanscrit (cc p 1203 G ed) can be taken otherwise than so that the result of the operation of seeing hearing &c falls directly upon the person or thing which one sees hears charges &c and then upon the action expressed by the infinitive which one in like manner sees hears &c The two objects of the verb are

* The Gothic syntax agrees with the Sanscrit in this that in the above sentence the adjective lame which is used adverbially and the particle having appear in Gothic as epithets of *thus* to thee thus in Sanscrit one can say, e.g. *taid nucharisa mayā saradā blavāṭayam* it is always to be by me following of thee (lit by me following)

co-ordinate, and stand in the relation of apposition to one another (I saw "him" and "falling," "*actionem cadendi*"). It appears, however, from the context, but is not formally expressed, that the action expressed by the second object is performed by the person or thing expressed by the first object ("I saw the stone fall"). To this head belong, for the most part, the examples collected by Gabelentz and Lobe, p 249, un-

[G Ed p. 1286] der 1.), 2), 3), 4),* of which I annex a few. John vi 62, *yabai nu gasarhvith sunu mans ussteigan*, "if ye shall see the Son of man ascend up" (ἐὰν οὖν θεωρῇτε τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἀναβαίνοντα), Matt. viii. 18, *haahait galeithan siprōnyōns hundar marein*, "he bade the disciples go over the sea," Mark i 17, *gatauya iqvis varrthan nutans mannē*, "I will make you to become fishers of men," (ποιήσω ὑμᾶς γενέσθαι ὀλιεῖς ἀνθρώπων); John vi. 10, *vaurkeith thans mans anakumbyan*, "make the men sit down," (ποιήσατε τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ἀναπεσεῖν), Luke xix 14, *ni vileum thana thiudanōn ufar unsis*, (οὐ θέλομεν τοῦτον βασιλεῦσαι ἐφ' ἡμᾶς) In the last-quoted example, and the others 1 c, n. 3), we cannot, indeed, follow the Greek-Gothic construction, we cannot say, *wir wollen nicht diesen herschen uber uns*, "we will not this to reign over us," but I doubt not, that here

* The following are to be excepted from No 2 Eph iii 6, where *visan*=εἶναι, stands in the nominative relation, and the accusative of the person expresses the relation "in respect of," and 1 Tim vi 13, 14, where, indeed, the infinitive *fastan* (τηρησαι) stands in the accusative relation, but the accusative *thuk* (σε) lies beyond the direction of the verb, and likewise expresses the relation "in respect of" Although *anabiuda*, like the Greek παραγγέλλω, governs the dative, nevertheless Ulfilas skips the Greek σοι, although, in order not to express the 2d person twice, he might as well have omitted the less important σε, which accompanies the infinitive to express a secondary idea, which is of itself tolerably patent Ulfilas, however, appears to find a truer imitation of the Greek construction in saying, "I give thee charge to keep (the keeping) in respect of thee the commandment," than in saying, "I give thee charge to keep the commandment"

here also the accusative of the person like that of the infinitive stands as object of the verb signifying "to will to seek to mean to believe to hope to know" &c. The Old High German still accords to this kind of construction a tolerably extensive use (see Grimm IV 116) e.g. *Notker er sih saget got sin* (*se deum esse dicit*) *Tat ih uerz megin fon mir uz gangan* (*novi virtutem de me exisse*) *Hymn unsih erstantan kelaubam's* (*nos resurgere credimus*)

§84 We now turn to a nearer examination of the Greek infinitive and must therefore first of all recall to remembrance the point of comparison which we have already obtained (p 1223 G ed) between the Vedic infinitives in *śā* and the Greek in *σαι*. If this comparison be based on a sure foundation we have in the termination *αι* [C Ed p 1287] of forms like *λῦσαι τυψαι* a genuine and as it were Sanscrit dative termination while the common Greek datives are based on the Sanscrit locative (see § 195). It is the more important to remark this as all other Greek infinitives partly in their common form and partly in their oldest form end in *αι* and therefore may be regarded as old datives which* are no longer conscious of their derivation and their original destination to express a definite case relation and hence can be used as accusatives and nominatives and in combination with the article as genitives also. Exactly in the sense of Sanscrit datives (which most usually express the causal relation) and as it were* is representatives of the Vedic infinitive datives like *pátai e* in order to drink on account of drinking, appear the Greek infinitives in sentences like *ἔδωκεν αὐτοῦ δουλοφρονησαι* *ανθρωπος πεφυκε φιλεῖν ἦλθε ζητῆσαι* (on account of the searching) *μοι θυομενω ιεναι επι τον βασιλεα ουκ εμμετο τα ιερα* (Xen Anab II 2 3). As regards the formal development or gradual defiguration we must antedate the form in *εμειαι* (e.g. *ακουεμειαι επιεμειαι, αξεμειαι*) as a point of departure for the infinitives in *ει* and that in *μειαι*

for the forms in *ναι* (as *διδό-ναι*, *τιθέ-ναι*). By dropping the case-termination *αι*, which had become unintelligible, there arose from *ε-μναι*, first *ε-μν* (*ἀκου-έ-μν*, *εἰπ-έ-μν*, *ἄξέ-μν*), and hence, by casting out the *μ*, *εν* (*Æol.* *ην*, *ἄγην*, *Doi.* *εν*, *ἄγν*) for *ε-εν*. The conjugation in *μι* shews also, in the common dialect, by forms like *τιθέ-ναι*, *ιστά-ναι*, *διδό-ναι*, *δαικ-νύ-ναι*, that the termination *αι* is essential to the infinitive thus the perfect infinitives (*τετυφ-έ-ναι*), and the passive aorist infinitives, which, according to their form, belong to the active (*τυφ-θή-ναι*, *τυπ-ῆ-ναι*), exhibit however, in the epic language, for the most part the full form *μναι*.

[G. Ed p 1288] 885 As regards the origin of the forms in *μναι*, I formerly thought ("Conjugations-system," p. 85) of deriving this *μναι* from the suffix *μνο*=Sanskrit *māna* of the participle middle and passive, so that *αι* would have taken the place of the *ο* of *μνο* like an adverbial termination. The derivation of an abstract substantive, which the infinitive is, from a participle, could not be a matter of surprise, but it would be strange, in the case before us, that the infinitives in *μναι*, &c, should be entirely excluded from the middle and passive, with the exception of the aorists with active form. If the infinitives in *μναι*, *μν*, *ναι*, *ν*, belonged to the middle or passive, their connection with the participles *μνο* would, in my opinion, be placed almost beyond doubt as active infinitives, however, I now prefer to derive them from the Sanskrit suffix *man*, which forms abstracts (see § 796), and I place them as sister-forms over against Latin abstracts like *certa-men*, *sola-men*, *tenta-men*, *regi-men* (see p 1083, § 801.), the *n* of which, in the Greek formations in *ματ*, is corrupted to *τ*, which, however, does not hinder a particular branch of this family of words, viz the infinitives, from asserting its right to a more ancient place by a firm retention of the old *n*, while the vowel has undergone the favourite weakening to *ε*. In Greek, therefore, the originally identical suffixes

μα-μοι (§ 7801) μοι which flow from one and the same source have the same relation to one another as regards their vowel that forms like ἔρα-τοι τερποῖα τρε-ωι have to each other with reference to their radical vowel. That this class of abstract substantives has been originally far more numerous in Sanscrit than in the condition of the language which has been bequeathed to us from the classic period is proved by the circumstance that both in the Vedic dialect and in /nd formations of this sort occur which are wanting in common Sanscrit. In the Vedic dialect e.g. *hantim* "the killing" (§ 1211) *yñiam gomam* "support" (Vajras 9. 22) in Zend *paēdaxwāc* "non the praising" (Sanskrit root *pr* "to praise") and Burnouf Journ As 1844 p. 10 translates its derivative *nyaxē* "agawāto man" "by" *yñē* "her". The Celtic languages also testify to a very extensive use of the forms in *ñiam* in the sense of pure abstracts at a time anterior to the separation of languages. To them correspond Irish abstracts in *inim* or *mhim* (see Picot p. 103) e.g. *geim-inim* "enquiring, begging" *geim-ea-mhim* "birth, conception" (Sanskrit *jan-man-jam-inim* "birth") *geill-a-mhim* "a promise, vow" (*geill-a-inim* "a promise, promising") *gaill-ea-mhim* "offence" *lean-inim* *lean-a-mhim* "following, pursuing" *alla-mhim* "instruction" (*all-inim* "I instruct") *scar-a-mhim* *scar-a-mhim* "separation". The abstracts of this kind are brought nearer to the Greek infinitives in *pe* *pece* in that some of them are actually used in Scottish Gaelic as infinitives at least Stewart cites among the rarer infinitive forms two also in *mhim* viz *geim-mhim* "to beg" and *lean-mhim* "to follow". There are in the Gaelic dialects also infinitives in *mh*, e.g.

* With *f* for *s* as conjunctive *r* wd root *h* from *hē* see § 1211 G ed.

† Another reading for the *stomach* mentioned above (§ 618) 737, Note) which I looked upon as an erroneous reading for the locative

seas-a-mh, "to stand," where the *a* is the class-vowel, but the *mh*, as has been already elsewhere remarked,* very probably an abbreviation of *mhuin*, as the bases in *n* in [G Ed p 1290] the Gaelic languages in the nominative frequently suppress the *n* (cf § 139), and, indeed, not unusually together with the vowel preceding.†

886 Should the Greek infinitives in $\mu\epsilon\nu$ not be abbreviations of $\mu\epsilon\nu\alpha\iota$, but have originally co-existed as different case-relations, we must assume that the datives in $\mu\epsilon\nu\alpha\iota$, which are formed according to Sanscrit-Zend principles, have been simply designed to express the causal relation (cf § 854), and that the forms in $\mu\epsilon\nu$, as naked neutral bases, were appropriated to the designation of the accusative and nominative relation, that, however, after the meaning of the termination in $\mu\epsilon\nu\alpha\iota$ had been forgotten by the language, the forms in ν and $\nu\alpha\iota$ have been used indifferently by the language. I here recall attention to the displacement of personal terminations, and their appearance in places which do not belong to them, *e g*, in the Gothic passive (see § 468 ‡), as also of the exaltation of the accusative plural to the universal plural termination in Spanish, while in Italian the nominative termination plural has been extended to all cases, but in Umbrian the ending of the dative ablative plural, which is more to the point here, has become the termination of the accusative, which hence in the said dialect terminates in *f* (= Sanscrit *bhyas*, Latin *bus*) § In English the pronominal forms "him" and "whom," which, in their origin, are datives, and, by their *m*, correspond with the Sanscrit *smāi* of *tāsmāi*, *yāsmāi*, &c.

* "The Celtic Languages," p 59

† Thus there exists, together with the above-mentioned *oll-a-mhain*, "instruction," a concrete *oll-a-mh* (genitive *oll-a-mhan*) "a doctor"

‡ In the German § 466, but it will be seen that this is a wrong reference

§ See Aufrecht and Kirchhof, p 113, and cf, *e g*, the accusative *tri-fu-f* with the Latin dative *tribus bobus* and Sanscrit *tri-bhyas gô-bhyas*

(see p 485) have assumed an accusative meaning and in order to express the dative relation require the help of the preposition 'to'. As regards the infinitive [G Ed p 1291] in particular it must further be remarked that the Vedic infinitives in *dhyāi* which usually denote the causal relation which belongs to their evidently dative termination (see § 851) occasionally occur also with an accusative signification. Thus we read in the Yajurv 6 3 *usmasi gumadhya* we will go. In Latin the infinitives in *re* if the explanation given above (§ 855) be correct have become altogether untrue to their original destination and appear only in the accusative or nominative relation while the Old Prussian infinitives in *tuci* which are likewise known as dative forms express only the accusative relation (see p 1219 G ed).

887 In favour of the opinion that the difference between the Greek infinitives in *ν* and *αι* is organic so that both forms which in the present condition of the language are of the same significance originally belonged to different case relations we must allow weight to the circumstance that in no other place of Greek Grammar do we meet with an entire abolition of the diphthong *αι* at the end of a word as in general in other languages also the diphthongs do not admit of being discharged so easily as the simple vowels because before their utter absorption the path is open to them to surrender one of the two elements of which they are composed. Universally where the Sanscrit Grammar exhibits *inē* (= *αι* see § 688 p 917) at the end of the inflexions the Greek preserves either *αι* for example in the medio passive personal terminations (*μαι σαι ται νται*=*ē sē tē nē*) or *οι* as in the plural nominatives of masculine bases in *ο* (e g Dor *τοι*=Sanskrit *tē* Gothic *thai* see § 228) and in one single termination *α* viz in the personal termination *μεθα*=Sanskrit *mahe* from *madhe* Zend *maudhē* (§ 472). In general the Greek per-

[G Ed p 1292] tinaciously retains the final vowels, and has not allowed the removal of any of the simple vowels but the hightest of all the primary ones, viz *i*, and this, too, but very seldom, perhaps only in the 2d person singular of the principal tenses ($\delta\iota\delta\omega\text{-}\varsigma = d\acute{u}d\acute{a}\text{-}\varsigma$, see § 418), while in Latin and Gothic the *i* has disappeared from the personal terminations the Gothic, indeed, has even dropped the entire diphthong *ai* in the dative singular, since the Gothic singular datives, with the exception of those of the feminine pronouns, as has been pointed out above (p 500, § 356 Remark 3), are in fact void of termination, so that, *e g*, *sunai*, "*filio*," corresponds to the Sanscrit *sūnāv-ē*, *auhsin* (theme *auhsan*) "*boi*," to the Sanscrit *úkshan-ē*

888 It remains for me only further to explain the Gicek infinitives of the middle and passive in $\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$, which I think I was before (p 659, § 474) wrong in explaining They share the termination *ai* with the active infinitives like $\lambda\hat{\upsilon}\text{-}\sigma\alpha\iota$, $\tau\acute{\upsilon}\psi\alpha\iota$, $\tau\iota\theta\acute{\epsilon}\text{-}\nu\alpha\iota$, $\tau\iota\theta\acute{\eta}\text{-}\mu\epsilon\upsilon\alpha\iota$, $\acute{\alpha}\kappa\omicron\upsilon\text{-}\acute{\epsilon}\text{-}\mu\epsilon\upsilon\alpha\iota$, $\tau\epsilon\tau\upsilon\phi\text{-}\acute{\epsilon}\text{-}\nu\alpha\iota$. I recognise the base of the passive or middle signification in the σ , which I now look upon as the reflexive, the original σ of which has, in $\omicron\hat{\upsilon}$, $\omicron\acute{\iota}$, $\acute{\epsilon}$, become the rough breathing (see §. 341. p 476), but before θ it occupies such a position that it could retire into a weak aspirate. But if the sibilant of forms like $\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\text{-}\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$, $\tau\acute{\iota}\theta\epsilon\text{-}\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$, belongs to the reflexive, these forms are, in this respect, based on the same principle as the Latin like *amari-er*, *legi-er* (see § 477) In general, a passive or middle infinitive, which was unknown to our great family of languages in its primæval period, would have been the easiest and most natural to acquire by affixing the reflexive, as the Lithuanian, too, transfers to the infinitive also the *s* appended to its reflexive verbs, *e g*, *wadim-ti-s*, "to name oneself" (see § 476 p 662). Similar is the procedure of the

[G Ed p 1293] Northern languages, in which the reflexive, in forms like the Swedish *taga-s*, "to be taken" (from *taga*,

'to take') is quite as unmistakable as in the indicative *take*-s (in the three persons singular see Grimm IV p. 16). In Greek forms like *λίσσασθαι* the reflexive lies the more hidden because it is not appended to the termination of the active infinitive and moreover there exists no active infinitive in *θαι* or *ται* from which *σθαι* might have sprung as above (§ 171) e.g. *δίδωσθαι* from *δίδωτοι*. Moreover in the infinitive no personal termination can be looked for and we durst not therefore in respect of the *θ* in forms like *δίδωσθαι* search for any analogy with such as *δίδωσθαι*, *δίδωσθε*, *δίδωσθω*. Moreover we cannot regard the *θ* of the middle passive infinitives as a formative suffix for it would be unnatural to interpose between the root and the formative suffix of an abstract substantive or pronominal element to express a reflexive or passive relation which would be as though from the Sanscrit infinitive and Latin supine *dātum*, *datum* we should look for a reflexive *dātum*, *dastum*. Hence therefore in departure from the conjecture I before expressed I now recognise in the syllable *θαι* of the infinitives under discussion an auxiliary verb and indeed the same that we recognised above (§ 630) in the aorists in *θη* and futures in *θησονται* with which are connected our *thun* and the Gothic *da dēdum* of forms like *sōkula* 'I sought (made seek)', *sōkūdēdum* 'we sought (made seek)' (see § 670). In Old High German an infinitive *sūh-tuan* ('to make seek') together with the actually existing *sūh-ta* (for *sūh-teta*) 'I sought (made seek)' could not surprise us and just as little strange would it be if the Greek *ζητεῖσθαι* were according to the explanation which has been given to signify literally 'to make to seek oneself' (= to be sought). It may here remain undecided whether the reflexive be appended after the theme of the said tense of the principal [G II p. 1901] verb or inserted before the auxiliary verb, whether therefore we should divide thus e.g. *τιπτεσθαι*, *τυπσασθαι*

τετύφ(σ)-θαι, τύπ-σσε-θαι, or τύπτε-σθαι, &c. The root $\theta\eta$ = $dhā$ of the auxiliary verb is in these compounds represented simply by its consonant, for the diphthong $\alpha\iota$ is, as in the active infinitive, a case-termination, where we must recall attention to the circumstance, that the Sanscrit root also, $dhā$, "to set, to make," which corresponds to the Greek $\theta\eta$ (from $\theta\bar{\alpha}$), as also all other roots in \bar{a} when they appear without a formative suffix as adjectives of common gender at the end of compounds, drop their final vowel before case-terminations beginning with a vowel, and hence, from $dhā$, "placing, making," comes the dative $dhē$ (= $dhar$, Greek $\theta\alpha\iota$). The root $dhā$ appears as an abstract substantive of the feminine gender in $\acute{s}rad-dhā$, "belief," properly, "belief-placing," or "belief-making," the dative of which, according to the universal principle of feminine bases in long \bar{a} , is $\acute{s}rad-dhāyāi$. In compounds with prepositions other naked roots in \bar{a} also occur as abstract substantives, e g, $\acute{a}-jñā$ and $anu-jñā$, "command," $prati-jñā$, "promise," $pi-a-bhā$, "lustre." $Dhā$, in the Vêdic dialect, with the preposition m , forms $mīdhā$ (see Benfey Gloss), which should properly signify "laying down," but has become an appellative with the meaning "net." As the root $dhā$ enters combinations more easily than other roots, and is suited for use as an auxiliary, the conjecture

[G. Ed p 1295] is not far fetched that it also has its share in the formation of the Vêdic infinitives in $\text{ध्या}\bar{y}\bar{a}\bar{i}$ discussed above (§ 854), whether it be that this $dh\bar{y}\bar{a}\bar{i}$ be

- The accumulation of consonants dislodged this reflexive σ , according to the analogy of § 543

† Cf Zend 𐬨𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬵𐬀 $yaōsch-dā$, "to make purify" (§ 637), $\acute{s}nādha$, "to make wash" (p 993), Latin $ven-do$ (§ 633), Greek $\piλῆ-θω$ (Pott, E I, p 187), $\piέρ-θω$. The first part of $\piέρ-θω$ answers to the Zend $pñi$, "to annihilate" (see Burnouf, Yaçṇ p 534, and Benfey, G R L II p 362), whereto belong also the Latin $per-do$ and $per-eo$ (as $ven-do$ compared with $ven-eo$)

an abbreviation of *dhāyāi* as dative of *dhā* or that the *d* of the root in this composition has been weakened to *f* for which the weight added by compounding may easily have given occasion*. The strictly feminine dative termination *āi* of infinitives like *pitrā dhyaī* would be better established according to this than if according to an earlier attempt at explanation *dhi* were taken as formative suffix and the *dh* as a distortion of *t*, as the feminine bases in short *i* in the dative more frequently exhibit *ayā* than *yāi* while polysyllabic feminine bases in *i* and in general those in a long final vowel never exhibit *ā* but only *āi* as the dative character. But if in the Vedic infinitives in *dhyaī* is involved the root *dhā* and in the Greek in *σθαί* the corresponding root *θη* there arises hence a remarkable affinity of formation between *यज्जि यज्जि ध्यायि* in order to venerate and *αἵε-σθαί* which is also radically identical with it (cf Ind Bibl III 102) which however could not induce me to recognise, with Lassen in the Vedic forms the infinitive of the middle for in the first place they want the sibilant which is so important an element [G Ed p 1206] in the Greek medio passive infinitives and secondly the Veda texts which have intermediately appeared have not furnished us with the means of perceiving any nearer relation of the forms in *dhyaī* to the middle. I should prefer to regard the possible affinity of formation of the Sanscrit and Greek infinitives in *dhyaī* *σθαί* in no other

* Cf the passives as *dh yātē pa yātē* for *dhi yātē pa jātē* I here further call attention to the Vedic *dhi* work action which occurs Naigh 2 1 under the words signifying *karman* action and perhaps as such is to be referred not like *dhi* understanding to the root *dhi yāi* to think, but as an anomaly of another kind to *dhā* to make. Although then this *dhi*, as a monosyllabic word forms in the dative *dhiyāi* or *dhyaī* this does not prevent the supposition that it in a primordial as it were privileged composition may follow the principle of the polysyllabic feminine bases in *i*, and may, after the analogy of *nadyau* form also *dhya i*

light than this, that the two languages, after their separation, accidentally coincided in an analogous application in the infinitive of a mutually common auxiliary verb, which can little surprise us, as this verb is well fitted in signification to enter combinations with other verbs, and to obtain the appearance of inflexions, and hence it occurs also in other members of our great family of languages in compounds more or less obscured. If, however, this auxiliary verb was once gained in Greek for the infinitive of the middle and passive, and, in its obscured nature, had once assumed the function of an inflexion, then the root ΘΗ combined itself with itself in combining with σ-θαί, just as, in the aorist and future, with θη-ν, θη-σομαι.

889. We have one more Sanscrit gerund to speak of, which indeed, as such, stands isolated in Sanscrit, but, with respect to its formation, presents many coincidences with the European sister-tongues, I mean, the gerund in *ya*. Its signification is the same with that in *tvá*, but it occurs almost only in compound verbs, while in the present condition of the language, as it appears to me, *tvá*, on account of its heavier form, avoids verbs encumbered with

[G. Ed p 1297] prepositions. The following are examples of gerunds in *ya* *ni-dháyā*, "after (with, through) laying down," *anu-śrútya*, "after hearing," *nu-gámya*, "after going out," *ni-vísya*, "after going in," *prati-bhídya*, "after cleaving," *á-túdyā*, "after impinging." I also consider these gerunds as instrumentals, and, indeed, according to the Zendian principle (see § 158), so that, therefore, *e g*, *nidháyā* stands for *nidháyā*, from *ni-dháyā-á*. I have already expressed this opinion in the Latin edition of my Sanscrit Grammar (p 250), and found it confirmed since then through Fr Rosen's edition of the first book of the Rig-

Zend.

R L Roots with a short final vowel receive the affix of a *t*. The accent *ven-do* compe radical syllable

veda in so far that there instrumentals from bases in *a* actually occur which are distinguished from their base only by the lengthening of the final *a* * so that, according to this principle one would have to expect from *a* base *nirgamyā* the going out in instrumental gerund *nirgamyā* while before with regard to the non insertion of *a* euphonic *n* I could only refer to the Vedic *svapnayā* (for *svapnéna*) analogously to which for *nirgamyā* the form *nirgamyayā* would be required

890 If one assumes that the abstract substantives which are to be presupposed for the gerund under discussion were neuter then they would have an exact counterpart in the Latin *od iu m gaud iu m stud iu m diluv iu-m dissid iu m incend iu m excid iu m obsid iu m sacrific-iu m obsequ iu m colloqu iu m praesag iu m contag iu m connub-iu m conjug iu m* as in Sanscrit therefore [G Ed p 1298] nearly all compounds In Greek *επει το ν αμπλακ το ν αμαρ το ν* belong to this class

891 The Sanscrit forms also by the neuter suffix *ya*, abstracts out of nominal bases the final vowel of which is suppressed with the exception of *u* which receives Gunā while the initial vowel is usually augmented by Vriddhi (see § 26) and accented e g *mādhur-ya m* 'sweetness' from *madhurā s* 'sweet' *nālpun ya m* 'skill' from *nipuna s* 'skilful' *sāukl ya m* 'whiteness' from *sukla s* 'white' *chāur ya m* 'theft' from *chōra s* 'thief' Hereto admirably correspond with respect also to the suppression of the final vowel of the primitive base the Gothic neuter

* E g *ma'hiti :* (Rigv I 52 13) 'through greatness,' from *malitā* (Vcl *māhi* 'great' suffix *tiā*) *mahitiand* (8, 7) id (*māhi* suffix *tiāna* see p 1216 G ed) *vrishatrā* (54 2) 'through rain' (abstr from *i rshan* 'rainer') This analogy is followed also by the Vedic *trā* 'through thee' (see Benf Gl p 100 and cf the Marathi *trā* see p 1167 G ed) f r *ti ya*

bases of abstract substantives like *diub-ya*, "theft," from *diub(a)-s*, "thief" (see § 135), *unléd-ya*, "poverty," from *unléd(a)-s*, "poor," *galeik-ya*, "resemblance," from *galeik(a)-s*, "like," *unvit-ya*, "ignorance," from *unvit(a)-s*, "foolish," *hauhst-ya*, "height," from *hauhst(a)-s*, "the highest." In the nominative accusative, according to § 153., the *a* of the suffix *ya* is suppressed, and *y* vocalised to *i*, hence, *diubi*, *unlédi*, &c. The following are Latui abstracts of this kind *mendac-iu-m*, *artific-iu-m*, *princip-ium*, *consort-iu-m*, *jejun'-iu-m*, *conviv'-iu-m*. This class of words is more scantily represented in Greek by forms like *μονομάχ'-ιο-ν*, *θκοπρόπ'-ιο-ν*. There belong, however, also to this class, though with their meaning perverted, words like *ἐργαστήρ-ιο-ν*, *δικα-ο-ήρ-ιο-ν*, *ληστήρ-ιο-ν*, *ναυπήγ-ιο-ν*, and from bases in *cu* such as *τροφῆ-ιο-ν*, *κουρῆ-ιο-ν*, with, as it appears, digamma suppressed, for *τροφέF-ιο-ν*, *κουρῆF-ιο-ν*.

892. In Old Slavonic corresponds the neuter suffix *иѣ nje* (euphonic for *yo*, see § 255. n, p 325), so that the vowel corresponding to the semi-vowel is also prefixed to it, while, however,

[G. Ed. p 1299] in Russian it is wanting, *весеѣиѣ veselje*, "joy," (Russian *веселіе veselie*) from *весеѣѣ vesel'*, "joyful." Abstracts in *аниѣ anije*, *еиѣ enije*, *ѣиѣ yenije*, *тиѣ tije*, are formed with the suffix under discussion from the perfect passive participle in a similar manner as in Old High German are formed, *e g farlāzaní*, "abandonment," *erwelití*, "choice," with the feminine form of the suffix *ѣ ya*, out of the participle belonging to the conjugation of the verb referred to, *e g*, *чаѣиѣ chayanije*, "expectation," from *чаѣанѣ chayan'*, "he expects," *ѣвѣиѣ yavlenije*, "unveiling," from *ѣвѣанѣ yavlen'*, "he discovers," *питѣиѣ putije*, "the drinking," from *питѣ pit'*, "drunken." With this suffix are formed also collectives in the Slavonic languages as in Sanscrit, *e g* in

* See Miklos, Radices, p 8. Dobrowsky (p 283) writes *весеѣиѣ*, and similarly in the other examples given p 282 of this class of words

Russian *дерево drevo*, many trees from *дерево drevo* a tree So in Sanscrit *kāśya-m* hairs from *kaśas* hair

893 In Lithuanian which has lost the neuter gender of substantives the class of words under discussion has become masculine, and then according to § 135 the syllable *ya* is contracted before the nominative sign *s* to *i* and the final vowel of primitive bases as in the sister languages is suppressed and thus with regard to the nominative it appears as though the simple change of *a* or *u* into *i* could form an abstract from an adjective Cf *e g*

<i>yod' i s</i>	blackness	with <i>yoda s</i>	black
<i>ilg i s</i>	length	with <i>ilga s</i>	long
<i>kars t i s</i>	heat	with <i>kars-ta s</i>	hot
<i>szalt i s</i>	coldness	with <i>-alta s</i>	cold
<i>aukszt i s</i>	height	with <i>auks-ta s</i>	high
<i>rugzt i s</i>	sourness	with <i>rugzt tu s</i>	sour
<i>daug i s</i>	multitude	with <i>daug</i>	many indeed

[G Ed p 1300]

In several of the oblique cases the *a* of these abstracts which is suppressed in the nominative is by the euphonic influence of the preceding *i* changed to *e* (cf § 157 p 174 Note*) hence *e g ilgie ms longitudinibus* compared with *ilga ms longis* Primitive abstracts also are formed in Lithuanian by the suffix *ia* euphonic *ie* nominative *i s* these correspond therefore exclusive of their vocalisation of the semi vowel to *i* tolerably well to the Sanscrit gerundial bases in *ya* *e g pūl i s* fall (*pulu* I fall) *musz i s* 'blow' (*mus-u* I smite) *kand i s* bite (*kandu* I bite)

894 The feminine form of the suffix य *ya* viz या *ya* forms primitive abstracts with the accent on the suffix *e g vrayā* travelling " *vidyā* knowledge *ayyā** the

* From *s yā* with irregular Guna as *e g* in *ś te* = *ṛ i* The *y* of the suffix acts like a vowel hence *ay* for *ē=ai*

lying." Hereto admirably correspond Gothic abstract feminine bases in *yô* ($\acute{o} = \acute{a}$, § 69.), nominative *ya* or *i*;* for example, *vrakya*, "pursuit" (gen *vrakyô-s*), corresponds also radically to the before-mentioned $\text{व्रज्य}\acute{a}$, with a tenuis for a medial, according to § 87. The other abstracts of this formation which have been retained to our time are, *brakya*, "strife," (properly, "breach"), *hrôpi*, "clamour," *hanti*, "command," *usvandi*, "environs." Observe, that *vrakya*, *brakya*, and *us-vandi* (gen *usvandyô-s*), have retained the true radical vowel, and hence correspond, not to the weakened present (*vraka*, *brika*, *vindo*), but to the [G Ed p 1301] monosyllabic forms of the preterite. So *bandi*, "band, fetter," *fôlu-bandi*, "leg-iron," on the other hand, *ga-bundi*, "band," with the extremest vowel-weakening of the present, and *ga-bundi*, id, with the middle vowel-weight of the polysyllabic forms of the preterite and perfect passive participle. An inorganic extension of the base with *n* (see § 142), is found in *rath-yô* (gen *yôn-s*), "reckoning, account," *sakyô*, "strife," | *vaii-yô*, "contest" (*veiya*, "I contend"), *ga-run-yô*, "overflowing" (*rinna*, *rann*, *runnum*).

895 In the Slavonic languages the class of feminine abstracts, which in Sanscrit is formed direct from the root by the suffix $\text{या } yâ$, is pretty numerously represented it ends in old Slavonic in the nominative in $\text{ia } ya$, e g, $\text{воля } volya$, "will," $\text{желя } schelya$, "mourning," $\text{купля } kûplya$ (л euphonic), "business." In Lithuanian the *a*-sound

* The contraction of *ya* to *i* occurs, if preceded by a naturally long vowel, or one long by position, or if one simple word of more than one syllable precedes (cf § 135 &c, Gabel and Lobe, p 61). The latter case, however, does not occur in the class of words under discussion.

† Cf the Gothic root *sak*, from *sag*, according to § 87, with the Sanscrit $\text{सङ्ग } sañg$, "affigere," with *abhi* (*abhishañg*), "maledicere, oburgare," *abhishanga-s*, according to Wilson, 1 "a curse or imprecation," 2 "an oath," 3 "defeat," 4 "a false accusation," &c

of this suffix has been usually changed by the euphonic influence of the semi vowel to *e* but the semi vowel is itself dropped (cf p 171 Note * and § 137) except in the genitive plural in *iu* or *yû* (see Rules 3d declension) Here belong for example feminine abstracts as *srouē* flood (*srauyū* I bleed Sanscrit *srau-ā-mi* I flow Greek *ρῶ*) *zinnē* the knowing knowledge (*zinnau* I know) *paine* entangling (*pinnu* I plait) *naltigonē* 'the keeping watch by night (*gunau* I watch) On the other hand *ia* is found in *pradīa* beginning (*pra de mi* I begin) for which in Sanscrit *pra dhā yā* would be to be expected *

896 The Latin formations of this class [G Ed p 1302] of feminine verbal abstracts in *ia* or *iē* (see § 137) like the neuter in *um* and the Sanscrit gerunds in *ya* are for the most part compounded (see § 890) e.g. *media invidia* (if not from *invidus*) *indemia desidia insidia excubia exsequia diluvie s perniciē s † esuriē s* The following are examples of formations of this kind *pluvia scabiē s* (properly the itching) *rubriē s* With the inorganic affix of an *n* and the substitution of an *ō* for *ā*—as e.g. in the suffix *tōr=tār* τῆρ § 647 and in *mon=mān* μῶν § 797—the Sanscrit suffix *yā* in some abstract feminine bases has been modified to *ōn* and these therefore correspond to

* The Lithuanian form has suppressed the radical vowel before the suffix otherwise it would be *pra-de ga*, as the semi vowel *y* between two vowels in Lithuanian as in Latin has remained but after consonants excepting *p b w m* (Mielcke p 4) has been changed to the vowel *i* *D* before *s* with a vowel following becomes *ds* (=dsch Sanscrit ढ) the *s* however is scarcely pronounced

† Without a base verb for it has hardly sprung from *perneco* as verbs of the 1st conjugation have produced no abstracts of this kind The radically cognate Sanscrit *na yamī* I go to ruin would lead us to expect a Latin verb of the 3d conjugation, as *nacio necio*, or *nocio* (cf *nex nocco*)

the above-mentioned (§ 894) Gothic bases in *γόν*, nominative *γό*; thus *con-tagió*, *-iôn-ι*, *suspició*, *obsidió*, *ambagió*, *capió*, as in Gothic *rathyó*, genitive *rathyôn-s*, &c. In Greek *iā* corresponds as exactly as possible to the Sanscrit *या yā*, but is, however, in the primary formation, but rather weakly represented. The following are examples *πενία*, *μανία*, *ἁμαρτία*, *ἀμπλακία*. In verbs in *ευω* (see §. 777), which especially favour this kind of formation of the abstract, the *υ* is lost before the suffix, but probably first passed, on account of the vowel following, into *F*, thus, *e g.* *ἀριστεία* from *ἀριστεFία*. More frequent is the appearance of the suffix *iā* (*ε-ιᾶ*) as a means of formation of denominative abstracts, in forms like *εὐδαιμον-ία*, *ἡλικ-ία*, *μακαρ-ία*, *ἀνδρ-ία*, *σοφ'-ία*, *κακ'-ία*, *δειλ'-ία*, *ἀγγελ'-ία*, *ἀναγωγ'-ία*, *στρατηγ'-ία*, *ἀλήθειᾶ*,

[G Ed p 1303] *ἄνοια* (*ἀνο'-ια*). To these denominative abstracts correspond in Latin, such as *capac-ia*, *feroc-ia*, *infant-ia*, *præsent-ia*, *inert-ia*, *concord-ia*, *inop-ia*, *perfid'-ia*, *superb'-ia*, *barbari'-ia*, *pauperi-ιῆ-s*, *barbar'-ie-s*, *un'ιθ(n)*, *tal'-ιθ(n)*, *commun'-ιθ(n)*, *rebell'-ιθ(n)*.

897 The Old High German has in all cases, except the genitive plural (*heilō-n-ō* for *heilýō-n-ō* see §. 246), dropped the vowel of the Sanscrit bases in *γόν*, which the Gothic has surrendered only in the nominative singular under the circumstances stated above (§ 894, Note ~), and has changed

* The bases in *εσ* (see § 128) lose their final consonant, as in the oblique cases, thus, *ἀλήθεια* from *ἀληθεσ-ια*, as *ἀληθέ-ος* from *ἀληθεσ-ος*. The combination of the *ι* of the suffix with the preceding *ε* or *ο* of the base word is the occasion of shortening the final *α*. The Homeric *ἀληθείη* also testifies to the original length of the *α* of such formations. In analogy with the phenomenon that bases in *ς* suppress this consonant before the suffix *ια*, is the phenomenon that bases in *ν*, in Sanscrit, suppress not only this consonant, but also the preceding vowel before vowels and the *γ* of a derivative suffix, hence, *e g.* *ιῆγ-γα-m*, "kingdom" (Gothic *riek-ι*, theme *riek-γα*, "dominion," from *reik(a)-s*, "ruler, supreme one"), for *ιῆγαν-γα-m*, from *ráγαν*, "a king."

the semi vowel into the corresponding long vowel (see Grimm's 2d strong decl fem) to which in the dative plural the case sign *m* (or *n*) is attached * To this class belong nearly all the words of Grimm's 2d declension feminine of the strong form (I p 618) which like the Gothic 3d weak declension feminine with the exception of the formations in *nissi* contains almost only abstracts which have been formed from adjectives (participles included) with the suffix corresponding to the Sanscrit *ya*, as e g [G Ed p 1304] *chalt i* cold *uarm i* warmth *hoh i* height *huldr i* grace *nâh i* nearness *seon-i* firmness beauty *suoz i* sweetness *stul i* stillness *tuf-i* depth *rot-i* redness *suarz i* blackness from the adjective bases *chalta* cold *uarma* warm † &c I call especial attention to the abstracts arising from passive participles corresponding to the Sanscrit in *ta* and *na* and formed with the suffix under discussion which irrespective of gender accord with the Slavonic abstracts mentioned above (§ 892), as *nutune pituie* the drinking *iaŕnune chajanuie* expectation The following are examples of Old High German abstracts of this kind *er uelit i* choice *ur uehsalot-i* alternation *ur terhinet i* pretext *var lâzan-i* abandoning *ar haban i* elevation *êrist-poran i* primogeniture from the participial bases *eruelita* (nom ter) &c *varlâzana* (nom nêr) &c The formations in *ni* (Grimm II 161 62) are much more numerous than those

* I conjecture that the *i* is long also in the dative plural thus *Teil m* as the long vowels maintain themselves better before a final consonant than at the end of a word Compare the conjunctive forms like *a...* opposed to *âziz az t a n* (see § 711 p 944)

† Nom ma.c *chalte r wârme r* with the pronominal affix of the strong declension (see p 368 § 288 Rem 5) At the beginning of compounds stands either the true base in *a* or and indeed more generally the base mutilated by the removal of *a* e g *mihula mot* and *mihul mot* magnanimous (Graff II 694) Of this more hereafter

in *tī* (Grimm II 261), but both spring from scarce any source but compound participles. It also deserves notice, that such formations are limited to the Old and Middle High German, with the exception, perhaps, of the Old Northern *um-gēngni*, "*conversatio*," mentioned by Grimm (p 162). I should not wish the above-mentioned remarkable coincidence between the German and Slavonic to be so interpreted as that any should found on it the conjecture of a special affinity between those languages, for since the Sanscrit suffix *या* *ya*, feminine *या* *yā*, as a means of formation of denominative abstracts in the European languages

[G Ed p 1305] has been universally diffused, it is not in the least surprising that the Slavonic and High German usually coincide in this point, that they have used this suffix also for the derivatives from passive participles. It might be possible that the Latin abstracts also in *tiōn*, *siōn*, were not formed, as has been before remarked (see p 1195 G ed), by an extension of the suffix *ti*, but have been derived from the passive participle with the aid of the *iōn* discussed above, thus, *e g*, *cocī'-iō(n)* from *coclu-s*, *mot'-iō(n)* from *motu-s*, *miss'-iō(n)* from *missus*, *orbāt'-iō(n)* from *orbātu-s*, as above (p 1303 G ed), *commun'-iō(n)* from *commun-s*, *un'-iō(n)* from *unu-s*, as in Old High German *erwelit'-ī* from *erwelita*.

898 It scarcely needs mention that the *e* of our abstracts like *Kalte*, ("cold"), *Warme*, ("warmth"), is the corruption of the *i* of the analogous High German abstracts, as in general nearly all vowels in the final syllables of polysyllabic words have, in New High German, and the majority so early as in Middle High German, been weakened to *e*. Without attention, however, to the intermediate stages, it would have been impossible, in words like *Kalte*, *Grosse*, *Lange*, ("cold, greatness, length"), to recognise an affinity of formation with the Sanscrit *banyyā*, "traffic" (from *bañij*, "trader"); and collectives like *gavyā*, "a number of

cows (from *go*) *pāsyā* a number of cords (from *pāsa*) to which correspond the Greek ἄθρακτα μυσμηκτα σποδτα. In High German this class of collectives has become neuter as in Slavonic (see § 892) and hence the suffix *ya* in Old High German has in the nominative and accusative been contracted to *i* (cf Gothic § 159) while in New High German it is either suppressed or turned into *e*. Before the base word is prefixed the preposition *ge* with (Old High German *ga gi* &c) hence *e g* Old High German *gafugil i* (for *ali*) *comptus avium* from *fugal* theme *fuyala* a bird (Middle High German *gevugele* New High German *Gevogel*) *gabein i* bone *ossa gabirg i* mountain mountains *gafild i* fields (properly many fields *agri arva*) *gadarm i* entrails [G Ed p 1306]

* *gistein i* stones *gisturn i* stars. As regards the relation of the *e* of our abstracts like *Kälte* to the Sanscrit *yā* this corruption answers exactly to that in the conjunctive of the preterite where *e g asse* corresponds to the Old High German *āzi* and Sanscrit *ad yā m ad yā t* (see § 711 p 944) on the other hand the Old High German *i* of *chalt* coincides with the contraction which the Sanscrit itself experiences in the middle of the potential where *e g ad i mahi* (from *ad yā mahi* see § 675) corresponds to the Gothic *ēt ei-ma* and Old High German *āz i mes*. The Anglo Saxon has in the class of denominative abstracts under discussion dropped the semi vowel of the Sanscrit *yā* and weakened the vowel to *o** hence *e g hælō* health *hyldo* grace *yldo* age compared with the Old High German *heil i huld i alt i*. The Gothic has further added an inorganic *n* to the *ya* contracted to *ei* (= *i* see § 70) which in the nominative is laid aside according to

* Probably from an earlier *u* as *e g* in the final syllable of *s qfon* 7 for Gothic *sibun* Sanscrit *saptan* and in the plural of the preterite *e g fōron*=Gothic *f rum* 3d person *fōrun*

§ 142⁺ Hence, *e g*, *hauh'-ei(n)*, "height," *drup'-ei(n)*, "depth," *lagg'-ei(n)*, "length," *brād'-ei(n)*, "breath," *manag'-ei(n)*, "multitude," *magath'-ei(n)*, "virginity," *παρθεν'-ία*, from the bases *hauha* (nom. m *hauhs*), &c., and the substantive base *magathr* (nom *magaths*) Moreover, from weak verbal themes in *ya* (Grimm's 1st conjugation) spring abstract bases in *em*, in which the verbal derivative in *ya* (= Sanscrit *aya*) is dropped before the abstract suffix *ein*; hence, *e g*, *ga-aggv-ei(n)*, "hemming in," from *ga-aggya*, "I narrow," *barht'-ei(n)*, "announcement," from *barhtya*, "I announce," *[G Ed p 1307]* *vaia-mēi-ei(n)*, "burthening," from *vaia-mēya*, "I burthen"[†] The inorganic *n* of this class of words occurs also occasionally in Old High German, but has here at the same time found its way into the nominative (see Grimm, I 628)

899 With the suffix *ya*, feminine *yā*, future passive participles also are formed in Sanscrit, which, for the most part, accent the radical syllable, but some the suffix, with the weaker accent (Svarita) The latter kind of accentuation occurs only in roots which terminate in a consonant (including the syllable *ar*, which is interchanged with *ṛ*),

⁺ In departure from § 142, I now think that the cases in which the Gothic *em* corresponds to the Sanscrit feminine character *i* ought to be limited to the classes of words mentioned in § 120, since in the *ei* of the class of words here discussed we must recognise a contraction of *yā*, after the analogy of the conjunctives, such as *ēt-ei-ma*, "we ate" = Sanscrit *ad-yā-ma*, Latin *ed-i-mus* (§ 711 p 944)

[†] There are in Old High German also verbal abstracts of this kind, only that the inorganic *n* is dropped; *e g*, *mend'-i*, "joy," from *mendru*, "*gaudeo*" (cf Sanscrit *mand*, "*gaudere*"), *touf'-i*, "baptism," from *toufin*, "I baptize" Observe, that in Sanscrit also the character of the 10th class and of the causal forms is suppressed before certain formative suffixes, while properly only the final *a* of *aya* ought to be suppressed (see § 109^a 6), *e g*, before the gerundial suffix *ya*, with which we are here most concerned, *ay* is usually suppressed, *e g*, *ni-vēd-ya*, "after the giving up," for *ni-vēd-ay-ya*

and which are either long by nature (length by position included) or aro in this class of words to which also belong appellatives which according to their fundamental meaning are future participles augmented by Guna or Vriddhi * At least *ā ī e* the heaviest of the simple vowels before two consonants in this class of words admits a different kind of accentuation whence it is clear that the language here seeks to avoid the combination of the greatest vowel weight with that of the strongest accent in one and the same syllable The following are examples *guhya s celandus guhya m subst a secret īdya s cele-* [G Ed p 1308] *brandus, śānsya s laudandus dāhya s mulgendus* (root *duh*) *drisya s spectandus* (root *dars driś* see § 1) *chēya s colligendus* (root *chi*) *stīvyā s* and *stāvya s laudandus, bhōya s edendus, bhōya m subst food* (root *bhuy*) *pāchya s coquendus* (root *pach*) *nīdya s arcendus* (root *īar īri* cl 10) *vākya m 'discourse as to be spoken* *kārya m business as to be done* (root *kār kṛi*) *bhāryā ī spouse as to be supported to be cherished* (root *bhār bhri*) Zend 𐬵𐬀𐬯𐬭𐬀𐬵𐬀 *rahmyō* (theme *ya*) in *rocandus* † To these admirably correspond some Gothic

* In the technical language of grammar this participial suffix in case it accents the Svarita, and provided the radical vowel is augmented is called *रयत nyat*

† From the denominative *rahmayēmi* with the suppression of the character of the 10th class as in Sanscrit *e g nīdya s arcendus* from *nīar ayā mi* No formal objection can be raised to the explanation given by Burnouf (l c p 576) according to which *rahmya* would come direct from the base *rahma invocatio* I prefer however that a form which evinces it elf by its signification to be a future passive participle should be also formally so explained in which as is shewn by the analogous forms in Sanscrit there is no difficulty Neriosengh too regards 𐬵𐬀𐬯𐬭𐬀𐬵𐬀 *rahmya* as also the *yasmya* which accompanies it of which hereafter as the future passive participles (Barn p 572) and translates the former by *su namaskaranīya* (*bene adorandus*) and the latter by *arāddhan ya* (*venerandus*)

adjective bases in *ya*, which, as has been already elsewhere remarked, are to be sought in Grimm's 2d adjective declension of the strong form (in Gabel and Lobe, p 71) Here we find the bases *anda-nēm-ya*, "agreeable," properly, "*accipiendus*;"* *unqvēth-ya*, "inexpressible" (root *qvath, qvitha, qvath, qvēthum*), *anda-sētya*, "contemptible, horrible" (root *sat*, "to sit," *sita, sat, sēlum, andl-sat*, "to be bashful"), *skeir-ya*, "clear, plain, intelligible" (*gaskeir-ya*, "I explain"),

[G. Ed p 1309] *un-nut-ya*, "useless," properly, "unenjoyable" (root *nut*, "to obtain, to enjoy," *nuta, naut, nutum*), *brūk-ya*, "serviceable," *un-bī ūk-ya*, "unserviceable," *ruur-ya*, "destructible, perishable, transitory" (*φθαρτός*), *un-ruur-ya*, "imperishable, ἀφθαρτος (*iuriya*, "I mar"); *sūt-ya*, "mild," properly, "*gustandus*" is identical with the Sanscrit *svād-yā-s* of *ā-svād-yā-s*, "*gustandus*," "*jucundi saporis*,"† and akin to *svādū-s*, "sweet" (Greek *ἡδύς*, Old High German *suozi*, "sweet," in the uninflected form), theme *suczia* = Gothic *sūtya* Among substantives, the neuter base *basya*, "berry" (n a *basi*), belongs to this class, if it corresponds, as I conjecture it does, to the Sanscrit *bháksh-ya-m*, "food," properly, "to be eaten" (from *bhaksh*, "to eat," Greek *φάγω*), and has lost the guttural of the root, in the same way as, e g, in Zend, the Sanscrit *akshi*, "eye," has been abbreviated to *ashu* In the Old High German *beru* (theme *berya*), the *s* has become *r*, as, e g, in *uárumés*, "we were" = Gothic *vésum*

Remark —The theory of the nominative singular of the adjective bases in *ya*, feminine *yó*, admits, now that we have before us the remains of the Gothic translation of the Bible in von Gabelentz and Lobe's edition, and, moreover, the Skeireins edited for the first time by Massmann, of

* From the root *nam* (*nma, nam, nēmum*) With regard to the lengthening of the radical *a* to *ē* (= Sanscrit *ā*, see § 69) in this and analogous forms, compare Sanscrit forms like *pāchya-s*, "*coquendus*"

† Root *svad* (seemingly from *su*, "well," and *ad*, "to eat"), "*gustare*," middle "*jucunde sapere*"

a more exact survey than was before possible and so in the masculine instead of the one form in *i s* which following Grimm, I gave in § 130 we possess in all four different gradations, for which Gabelentz and Lobe (Grimm p 74) give as examples *sutis hrains nuus* and *tiltheis*. The more perfect form *yi-s* for the according to § 67 impossible *ya s* occurs when any vowel or a simple consonant with a short vowel precedes it goes before hence *nuu yi s* 'new' *sak yi s* 'quarrelsome'. Hence also from the base *midya* the nominative masculine, which can not be cited can only be *midyi s* (=Sanskrit *mudhya s* Latin *medius*) not *midi s* as was assumed above (§ 130) as the contracted form of an earlier *midyi s* is then *midyi s* corresponds to the [G P d p 1310] Sanskrit *mādīya s* so does *nuu yi-s* to the Sanskrit *nār-ya-s* and Lithuanian *nau ya s* which are equivalent in signification and thus therefore *nuuyi s* shews itself to be a future passive participle, for *nuuyi nār-ya s* according to its derivation can only be regarded as such as it like the more current *nāra s** on which the Latin *noius* Greek *νι(φ)ος* and Slavonic *novo* (themo and *n a nent*), are based springs from the root *nu* 'to praise' and originally signifies 'laudandus'. Normally it corresponds to the above mentioned *stāya s*, from *stu*. If the syllable *ya* in Gothic adjective bases be preceded by a long syllable terminating in a consonant it is contracted in the nominative masculine either to *ei* as in similarly constituted substantive bases (see § 130) or to *i* or it is as is most commonly the case entirely suppressed. Instances of the first kind are forms like *alth-ei s* 'old' and *tilth ei s* 'wild' of the second *s t t s*† *mild* and *airkn i s* 'holy' of the third *hrain s* 'poor' *gamain s* 'common' *gafaur* 'fasting' *bruk s* 'serviceable' *bleith s* 'kind' *andanm s* 'agreeable'. To this class belong *alya kun s* *all yevns* (Luke xvii 18) for which on account of the indubitable shortness of the *u* *alya kun gi s* might be expected it appears however that the loading of the word by composition or generally the circumstance that in the entire word more syllables than one precede the

* This is the accentuation at least in the Veda dialect according to Wilson however who gives this word the suffix *ach* (*ch* denotes the accentuation of the suffix) this adjective would in the common language be oxytone as most of the adjectives formed with *a* (see Wilson's Grammar 2^d Edition p 310)

† Grimm assuredly with correctness deduces the length of the *u* from the Old High German *suozu*. If it were short the nominative would most probably be *sutylis*

suffix *ya*, has occasioned the suppression of the suffix in the nominative (cf § 135) :

[G Ed p 1311] 900 The Lithuanian also has some remains of the future passive participle under discussion, but

V Gabelentz and Lobe (Grammar, p 74) assume, in the class of adjectives here spoken of, bases in *i*, though, with respect to the corresponding substantive declension, they agree with me that the same contains bases in *ya*. With regard to the adjectives, however, the cognate languages, and the oblique cases of the Gothic itself, speak just as emphatically in favour of the proposition that the bases of Grimm's 2d declension of the strong form end in the masculine and neuter in *ya*, and in the feminine in *yô* (= Sanscrit *yâ*), whence, according to § 137, we should have *ya* in the nominative. The agreement of *muyi-s*, "*novus*," *muya*, "*nova*," with the Sanscrit *nâvya-s*, *nâvyâ*, and the Lithuanian *nauya-s*, *nauya*, and that of *miðyi-s*, *miðya*, with the Sanscrit *mâdhya-s*, *mâdhyâ*, and Latin *mêdu-s*, *media*, speaks very decidedly against the opinion that the *y* of the Gothic forms is an insertion (l c p 75, d c). Just so the *y* of the base *alya* (nominative, most probably, *alyi-s*) is identical with the Sanscrit *y* and Latin *i* of *anyâ-s*, *alu-s* (§ 374). I cannot allot to this class feminine nominatives in *s*, as the feminine bases, which in Sanscrit terminate in *â*, have, from a period so early as that of the identity of languages, lost the nominative sign (see § 137). I regard, therefore, the forms *brûks*, "*serviceable*," *sêls*, "*good*," and *skêrs*, "*clear*," although in the passages where they occur they refer to feminine substantives (1 Tim iv 8, 1 Cor xiii 4, Skeir IV b), as masculine nominatives, which, in consequence of a peculiarity of syntax, represent adverbially, as we use uninflected adjectives (*er ist gut*, *sie ist gut*, "*he is good*, *she is good*"), the nominative of that gender, whatever it may be, to which the substantive referred to belongs. Thus, as has been elsewhere shewn (Nalus, 2d Edit, p 214), in Sanscrit the masculine nominative singular of the present participle may, by an abuse, refer to any gender or number, in sentences like *bhârmî sântvayan uvâcha*, "*Bharmî spake flattering*" (for *sântvayanti*), and, in like manner, in Ulfilas (Rom vii 8), the masculine participial base *nmands*, "*taking*," refers to the feminine substantive *fravaunhts*, "*sins*," to which, in the very same passage, also the masculine *navis*, "*dead*," refers *inu vitôth fî avarhts vas navis*, "*without the law sin was dead*." The actual feminine nominatives of *brûks*, &c, could scarcely be caught else than *brûki*, *sêli*, *skêri*, according to the analogy of substantive forms,

only in a substantive form To this class [G Ed p 1312] belong *ualg* *is* (from *ualg ya s* see § 135) food as 'to be eaten (*ualgau* "I eat") *zod* *is* word as 'to be spoken (cf *zad* *as* speech *zadu* I promise Sanscrit *gad* to speak) In Latin *eximius* properly = *eximendus* is according to its signification the truest remnant of this class of words Formally *genius* also and *ingenium* belong to this class To the latter corresponds in root and formation the Gothic neuter base *kun ya* nominative *kuni* sea In Greek *αγισ* (originally akin to *αζω*) corresponds to the Sanscrit *yaj ya s* 'venerandus From a Greek point of view the following are more plain *στυγισ φρυγισ παγισ* Παλλα ball as 'to be thrown is to be derived I conjecture from *παλγα* by assimilation * in the same way as *παλλω* from *παλγω* but with this difference that while the 2d λ of *παλλω* is based on the Sanscrit character *ya* of the 4th class † and hence is excluded e g from the abstract *παλο* *s* the λ of *παλλα* corresponds to the *ay* of the participial suffix under discussion Παλλα therefore and *παλλω* with regard to the consonant which follows the root have just as little in common as e g in Sanscrit *lobh ya s* desire

with a long penultima as *ἡρόι*, 'clamour (see § 891 Note) Such a form have we then actually existing in the of its kind unique adjective form *εὐθι grata* (nom masc probably *εὐθι*) where it is important to remark that in the single passage where it occurs (2 Cor 11 15) it does not stand like the masculines *bruks* *sets* *skeirs* which represent in the before mentioned passages the feminine as predicate but as epithet

we are unto God a sweet savour of Christ (*Christus datus sicut εὐθι gods*) I do not believe that Ulfilas could here have written *εὐθι* for *εὐθι* and I consider the latter form as feminine nominative in the said passage entirely free from suspicion provided the noticeable masculine nominative be *εὐθι* or according to the analogy of *sūtis* *εὐθι* (cf Gabelentz and Lobe I c)

* See p 414 G ed § 300

† See § 501

randus," and *lúbh-ya-té*, "*desiderat*" I agree with G. Curtius ("*De nominum Græcorum formatione*," p 61) in referring to this class also *φθί-δ-ιο-ς* and *ἀμφά-δ-ιο-ς*, as also *ἐκτά-δ-ιο-ς*. The inserted *δ* may be compared with the *t* which, after short vowels, is prefixed to the Sanscrit gerundial suffix *या*, or, which is here more to the purpose, with that of some ap-

[G Ed p 1313] pellatives, which, according to their fundamental meaning, are future passive participles, as, *chí-t-ya-m*, "funeral-pile," properly "*colligendum*" (from *chi*, "to collect"), *bhí-t-ya-s*, "servant," as "to be supported," from *bhar*, *bri*, "to bear, to support, to nourish" To this class, according to its formation, belongs, although with active signification, the Greek *στά-διο-ς*, properly "standing" (cf. *στα-τός*=*stí-tá-s*).

901. The Greek *ιο* is of more common occurrence as the formative suffix of denominative adjectives (Buttmann, § 119 67) than in the primary formation of words, and here, likewise, has its Sanscrit prototype in the secondary (Taddhita) suffix of words like *dív-ya-s*, "heavenly," from *div*, "heaven," *híid-ya-s*, "amiable, agreeable," from *híid*, "heart," *ágr'-ya-s*, "the most excellent" ("standing on the summit"), from *ágra-m*, "summit," *dhán'-ya-s*, "rich," from *dhána-m*, "wealth," *śún-ya-s*, "canine," from the weakened base *śun*=Greek *κυν*, *ráth'-ya-s*, "car-horse" ("belonging to the car"), *ráth'-ya-m*, "car-road," from *rátha-s*, "car," *yásasyà-s*, "famous," from *yásas*, "fame," *rahas-yà-s*, "secret," from *ráhas*, "mystery," *náv-yà-s*,

In the two last examples the demission and weakening of the accent is occasioned by the circumstance that the suffix is preceded by more than one syllable, with which may be compared the phenomenon, that, in Gothic, the same suffix, under the same circumstances, experiences in the nominative a contraction or suppression (see § 135) In *náv-ya-s* (Pan VI 1 213) the long *á* has the same influence in weakening the accentuation that, in Gothic, *e g*, the *ú* of *sút-iz*, has in weakening the suffix

navigable from *nau s* ship The following are examples in Zend *𐬀𐬎𐬌𐬌𐬎𐬎𐬀 ya* *domesticus* from *𐬀𐬎𐬌𐬌𐬎𐬎𐬀* house *𐬀𐬎𐬌𐬌𐬎𐬎𐬀𐬌𐬌𐬎𐬎𐬀 ya* regarding the Ahura (with Vriddhi) from *ahura* *𐬀𐬎𐬌𐬌𐬎𐬎𐬀 ya* yearly from *𐬀𐬎𐬌𐬌𐬎𐬎𐬀* a year *𐬀𐬎𐬌𐬌𐬎𐬎𐬀𐬌𐬌𐬎𐬎𐬀 gaōschdāthr - ya* purifying purifier from *𐬀𐬎𐬌𐬌𐬎𐬎𐬀𐬌𐬌𐬎𐬎𐬀 yaōschdathra*

means of purification (§ 817) *𐬀𐬎𐬌𐬌𐬎𐬎𐬀 ya* earthly from *gaēthā* (nom *gaētha* see § 137) earth [G Ed p 1314]

So in Greek *e g* *αλίοσ* *αγωνίοσ* *ηγέμονίοσ* *πατρίοσ* (=Sanskrit *pitr ya s* fatherly) *σωτήριοσ* *φιλοτήσιοσ*, (from *-τήριοσ*) *θαυμασιόσ* (from *θαυμάτιοσ*) *εκουσιόσ* (from *εκοντιόσ*) *τελειόσ* (from *τελεσιόσ* see § 128) *επιτηδεύσιόσ* (from *επιτηδεύσιόσ*) *ὄρειόσ* (from *ορειόσ*) *γελοιόσ* (from *γελώσιόσ* for *γελώτιόσ*) *ετησιόσ* (for *ετεσιόσ* from the base *etes* whence also *ἔτειοσ*) *ουρανίοσ* *ποταμιόσ* *θαλασσιόσ* *κοντιόσ* *λυσσιόσ* *φύξιόσ* *ασπασσιόσ* (from the to be presupposed verbal abstract *ασπασσιόσ*) *πηχυσιόσ* *τριπηχυσιόσ* *δικαιοσ* *ακμαῖοσ* *αμαξαῖοσ* *αμοιβαῖοσ* The four

last examples as most of the derivatives from words of the 1st declension depart from the original principle in this that they retain the final vowel of the base (always as *α* as in the nom pl) before the suffix The diphthong which grows up in this manner occasions in most cases the displacement of the accent in which respect I recall attention to a similar phenomenon in Sanskrit (see § 899)

The retention of the *υ* of *πηχυσιόσ* and *τριπηχυσιόσ* answers to the retention of the *u* in Sanskrit (§ 891) *e g* in *ritav-ya s*

annual from *ritu s* Here belong also gentilia like *Σαλαμινίοσ* *Κορινθίοσ* *Μιλήσιόσ* (from *τιόσ*) *Αθηναῖοσ* proper names as *Απολλωνίοσ* *Διονυσίοσ* neuter appellations of temples and sanctuaries called after the god to whom they are dedicated as *Απολλωνίων* names of feasts in the plural as *Διονυσία* and perhaps feminine names of countries derived from the names of their inhabitants as *Αιθιοπία* from *Αιθιοπίοσ* *Μακεδονία* from the base *Μακεδοί* To the proper

names correspond Sanscrit patronymics like *kāurav-yá-s*, "Kurude" from *kuru*, in which the first vowel of the primary word receives the Vriddhi augment, while the accent has sunk down upon the final syllable.

902. In Latin this class of words is less numerous than in Greek, yet to it belong, both various adjectives and [G Ed p 1315] appellatives, and also proper names. The following are examples. *egregi-u-s*, *patr-u-s*, *imperator-iu-s*, *prætor-u-s*, *censor-u-s*, *soror-u-s*, *nox'-u-s*, *lud'-u-s*, (from *ludu-s*, not from *ludo*), *Mar-iu-s*, *Octav'-u-s*, *Octav'-ia*, *Non'-u-s*, *Non'-ia*. As regards the appellatives of countries in *ia* in Greek, and their relation to the names of the inhabitants, attention must be recalled to the circumstance, that above (§ 119) we have recognised the Greek *ia* as the simple extension of the Sanscrit feminine character *ī*, among other words, in feminines in *τρια* (*ὀρχήστρια*) compared with the Sanscrit in *trī* (*dātṛī*, "female giver," see § 811); accordingly, the names of countries in *ia* might also be taken as simple feminine formations of the base words expressing the names of the inhabitants, so that, therefore, *e. g.*, *Μακεδονία* would appear in a Sanscrit form as *Makadan-ī*, and would properly signify "the belonging to," not to say "the spouse," of the Macedonian, or, too, "the mother" of all the Macedonians. This view would receive emphatic support from the circumstance, that there are also names of countries with feminine themes in *ιδ*, the *ιδ* of which, = Sanscrit *ī*, has the same relation to the primary word denoting the inhabitant, as above (§. 119.) *ληστρο-ιδ* (for *ληστρο-ιδ*) has to *ληστήρ*, or as, *e. g.*, *ἡγεμον-ιδ* to the masculine base *ἡγεμον*, and much the same as, in Sanscrit, *mahatī*, "the great," (fem.) has to *mahát*. The following are examples of this kind. *Ἀβαντίδ* from *Ἀβαντ* (*Ἀβαντ-ες*), *Περσ-ιδ*, "Persia," from *Πέρση-ς*, "Persian man," feminine *Περσίς*. If, however, the Greek names of countries in *ia* are only the feminines of the names of the inhabitants, and if their ter-

mination is only an inorganic extension of the Sanscrit feminine character : we might also explain in the same manner the Latin as *Gallia Germania Italia Græcia*, and assume that the *n* (= Sanscrit *a* Greek *o*) of the masculine bases *Gallu Germanu Italu Græcu* is suppressed before the feminine character : extended to *ia* according to the same principle as that by which in Sanscrit, the *a* e g of *dēva* 'God' (nom *deva* s) is suppressed [G Ld p 1316] before the *i* of *devi* goddess and as in Greek, the *o* e g of the base *Δακo* is lost before the feminine *ia* of *Δακ ia*. We can even in the names of towns *Florentia Valentia Placentia* recognise feminine participles the special form of which has been lost in the proper participles as, in general the adjective bases ending in a consonant have transferred to the feminines also the form which originally belongs only to the masculine and neuter. Feminine participial forms like *ferentia tudentia* compared with the Sanscrit *bharanti tudanti* and Greek *φερουσα* from *φεροντια* cannot surprise us in Latin. Observe also the affix which in Lithuanian the feminine participle has gained in the oblique cases (see § 157 Note* p 174 and § 950)

903 To the Sanscrit denominative adjective bases in *ya* as *div ya* heavenly (§ 901) correspond most exactly some Gothic bases in *ya* feminine *yō*, viz *alev ya* *olwifer* from the primitive base *alēva n* nom *alev* oil *alth-ya* old from *althi f* nom *alth s* *nau ya* dead (nom *m navis*) from *navi m* nom *naus* dead (*m*) *ana haim ya* homely *af haim ya* absent from *haimō f* nom *pl haimō-s*, *reil ya* chief from *reika m* nom *reiks* supreme chieftain *uf aith-ya* sworn from *aitha m* nom *aith s* oath *in gard ya* homely domestic from *garda* nom *gards* house *un kar ya* careless from *karō f* nom *kara* care. The definitions laid down above (p 1309 G ed Rem) hold with respect to the nominative masculine of these adjective bases. To the Sanscrit denominative

appellative bases like *ráth'-ya*, m. "car-horse," n "car-wheel," correspond in Gothic such as *leik-ya*, "doctor" (nom *leik-eis*, see § 135), from *leika* n, nom. *leik*, "the body," *harrd'-ya*, "herdsman," from *harrdó* f, nom *harrda*, "heid," *blóstr'-ya*, "worshipper," from the unciteable primitive base *blóstra* (see § 818), *fauistass'-ya*, "superintendent," from

[G Ed p 1317] the unciteable *fauistassi*, "the superintendence" (from *-stas-ti*, s from *d*, according to §. 102), nom *fau-stass* (cf. *us-stass*, "resurrection"); *ragin'-ya*, "counsellor," from *ragina* n, (nom *ragin*, "counsel") The Gothic marks also with the favourite extension of the base by n masculine bases like *fisk'-yan*, "fisher" (nom *fiskya*, according to § 140), *gud'-yan*, "priest," *vauistv'-yan*, "labourer," *aurt'-yan*, "planter, gardener," *var-dēd'-yan*, "malefactor," from the primitive bases *fiska*, m "fish," *guda*, m. "God," *vauistva*, n "work," *aurti*, f "plant," and the to-be-presupposed *var-dēdi*, f "misdeed" (*dēdi*, nom. *dēds*, "deed," see § 135) There are also some primitives, i e substantive bases, in *yan*, springing from verbal roots, which, according to their signification, are nouns of agency, viz *af-ēt-yan*, "eater, devourer" (root *at ita*, *at*, *ētum*), *af-drugk-yan*, "drinker, tippler," *vein-drugk-yan*, "wine-drinker" (root *dragk* = *drank* *drigha*, *dragk*, *drugkum*), *dulga-hait-yan*, "creditor," (literally, "debt-namer"), *bi-hait-yan*, "boaster," *anbi-num-yan*, "heir," literally, "inheritance-taker" (root *nam nima*, *nam*, *nēnum*, *numans*), *faura-gagg-yan*, "intendant" (root *gagg*, "to go," see § 92), *ga-sinth-yan*, [G Ed p 1318] "companion," properly, "goer with"*

* Root *santh*, whence we should expect an unciteable verb *sintha*, *santh*, *sunthum* (see Grimm, II p 34), and whence, also, is formed by the suffix *an* (nom *a*), *ga-sinthan*, of equivalent meaning, which answers to Sanscrit bases like *rājan*, "king," as "ruler" The causal *sandya*, "I send" ("make to go," see § 740), has the same relation, with regard to its *d*, to *santh*, that *standa*, "I stand," has to *stôth*, "I stood" Yet the *d* of *sandya* is more organic than the *th* of *santh*, at least *sand* can be
more

From weak verbs too spring some formations of this kind and indeed so that the conjugational character is rejected before the formative suffix (cf p 1303 G ed) hence *suigl yan* piper from the verbal base *suiglō* to pipe, and *tumr yan* (scarcely to be divided *tumry an*) carpenter properly *edificator* from *tumrya*, to build* To the bases in *yan* which spring from roots of strong verbs correspond in Sanscrit exclusive of the appended *n* besides some adjective bases as *ruch ya* pleasing agreeable *sādh-ya* complete also some masculine or neuter appellative bases in *ya* which according to their fundamental meaning are nouns of agency or present participles and accent some the radical syllable some the suffix The following are examples of which I annex the nominatives *sur ya s* the sun as shining * *bhid ya s* [C Fd p 1310]

more easily compared with the Sanscrit than *santh* whether we betake ourselves to the root *sādh* 'to go to attain' or to *sad* 'to go for' for *dh* we find in Gothic regularly *d* and the pure medial, which, according to § 87 becomes *t* might well have maintained itself in the case before us under the protection of the annexed liquids (cf § 90)

* The Indian Grammarians assume a root *sur*, 'to shine' which I regard as a contraction of *sar* which is contained entire in the radical word *sar* heaven (as 'shining') on which is based the Zend *harrē* sun According to this in *surya* the syllable *ia* or its lengthened form *īa* would be contracted to *u* If however *sur* were the old form of the root, its vowel would have become lengthened in *surya* The Creek *ῥῆις* (from *σφῆλιος*) favours, however the supposition that the form *surya s* is an abbreviation of *sārya s* As regards form there would be nothing to prevent the derivation of *surya* from *sār* heaven from *sar* then would be formed first *sarya* (as *duya* heavenly from *du*) and thence *surya s* I gladly however abandon this explanation which has been already elsewhere proposed as it appears to me more natural to represent the sun as shining than as heavenly The Lithuanian feminine *saulė* exhibits correctly, according to rule *e* for *ia* or *ya* I explain the Gothic neuter base *saula* (nom *saul*) as formed by transposition from *saulia* and this latter from *sralja* and thus, also the Lithuanian *au* of *sauk* may have arisen from *ua* If any one however will follow

“river,” as “cleaving, breaking through;” *śal-yá-s*, “javelin, arrow,” as “moving itself.” To these are to be added some

follow Weber (V S Sp I p 57) in deriving the Sanscrit *sūrya* from *sūra* of equivalent meaning, and the latter, according to Indian Grammarians, from *sū*, “to bear, to bring forth” (Unâd II 35), then *sūrya-s* and *sūra-s* would originally signify, “bringer forth, producer” I, however, prefer, as has been already elsewhere done (Glossar Sert a 1847, p 379) to refer *sūra*, though there is no formal impediment to the deriving it from *sū*, to the root *sur* (*sur*), “to shine,” and I recall attention to the fact, that in Zend, too, *𐬰𐬀𐬭𐬀* *hvar̥* (euphonic for *hvar*, see § 30), the syllable *va* has been contracted to *û* in perhaps all the weak cases, of which, however only the genitive *hūr-ô* can be cited, which hereby stands in a relation to its nominative accusative and proper theme similar to that which the Greek *κυν-ός* holds to *κύνω*, and cannot possibly be derived from a different root from that to which the nominative accusative *hvarē* belongs On *𐬰𐬀* *svār* is based also the Latin *sol* (from *suol* for *suai*, as *sopio* from *suopio*, from the Sanscrit root *svap*) and the Greek *σεῖρ*, from *σφερ* with that favourite affix before liquids, *i*, which occurs also in *Σειρήν*, which, with the Latin *ser-mo*, belongs to the Sanscrit root *svar*, *svi*, “to sound,” whence comes the Vêdic *sūayā*, “speech,” as “spoken,” or “to be spoken,” and in which likewise occurs the contraction of *va* or *vâ* to *û* The opinion that *sūra-s*, “sun,” springs from *sū* or *su*, “to bear, to produce,” finds confirmation in the fact, that another appellation of the sun, viz *sav-i-tāi* (*-trî*), has decidedly arisen from the root *su* or *sū* This word occurs frequently in the Vêdic hymns I would not, however, from the circumstance that the Vêdic poets delight in extolling the sun-god as “producer” (of the produce of the fields), as also as “supporter” (*pūshan*), deduce the inference that the proper designation of the sun, which existed so early as the time of the unity of the languages, must have pointed towards this image, for it certainly approximates more to the primary view of people to designate the sun as “lighting,” or “shining,” than as “producing,” or “nourishing” To the Sanscrit names of the sun belongs also the hitherto unciteable *sūvana-s* (Unâd II 78), which, as a derivative from the root *su* or *sū*, is perhaps only a poetical and honorific title of the sun It may, however, be possible, that the root which lies at the base of the word *sūvana-s* is not the well-known root of “to bear,” but an abbreviation of *svar* or *sur*, “to shine,” as, e g, together with *hu*, “to offer,” exists also a root *hu*, “to call,” abbreviated from *hvé* (= *hvar*), together with *śvi*, “to grow,” a form

feminine oxytone bases in *ya* e.g. *lanyá* a [G Ed p 130] maid as shining (in the lustre of youth) from *lan* to shine *yáyá* 'spouse as 'having children (for *janyá* root *jan*) The following are examples in Zend *𐬨𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬵𐬀* *berēz ya* growing or with a causal signification making to grow *𐬨𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬵𐬀* *mair ya* slaying (making to die) [G Ed p 131]

form *su* and in Zend together with *𐬨𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬵𐬀* *an* to strike a form *a* whence *𐬨𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬵𐬀* *uy i* -dit "let him strike (cf § 67) and together with *𐬨𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬵𐬀* *ir* to live the forms *𐬨𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬵𐬀* *i* and *𐬨𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬵𐬀* *ir* Might we assume together with *𐬨𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬵𐬀* *sur* to shine " a root *si* of the same meaning I should derive from it the appellation of the moon too *sú ma* which would therefore develop a radical in affinity with the Greek *σελήνη* (from *σ(ε)λήνη*), while another *sú-ma* (the *Soma* plant) belongs to a different root *su* which signifies to express. If *su-ma* be a genuine appellation of the sun it will admit of comparison with the Gothic base *sunnan* (nom *sunna*) by assimilation from *sunnan* for *suranan*. But if the Sanscrit *surana* originally signify producer I would rather derive the Gothic base *sunnan* (also *sunnon* fem) from *suranan* or *surnan* and thus in like manner by assimilation so that it would be based on the root *𐬨𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬵𐬀* *sur* to shine to be light and *nan f r na* would be the formative suffix the feminine form of which is contained in the Latin term also for the moon (*luna* from *lucna*)

* Root *lārē- bēz* (cf *barē nu* 'great') = Sanscrit *varh* *vrīh* to grow (see Burnouf *Āgna* p 18.) I have no scruple in assigning with Anquetil to this root in the passage referred to (V S p 4) a causal signification and I recall attention to the fact that in Sanscrit too especially in the Vedaialect the root *varh* *vrīh* with which *varh vrī* is originally one is often used in its primitive form with a causal signification Above (p 118, § 179 L 19) the Zend root *lārē- bārēz* is erroneously placed beside the Sanscrit root *bhr* 'to shine' the participle *b r-ant* of which I mention is made signifies properly growing and hence great high like the Sanscrit *vrī t* (strong *vrī lānt*) which corresponds to it and by which it is also occasionally rendered by Deriosengh whose translation I was unable to procure and of which even up to the present time I only know the passages published by Burnouf (see Burnouf's Review of the First Part of this Book in the "Journal des S", 1833 p 43 of the special impression and Brockhaus Glossary 1 381 8.)

"murder," *жмюж kainé* from *kainýd*, "maid," as "shining." In Lithuanian to this class belong, first, several masculine bases in *ia* (nom *is* or *ys* for *ia-s*, see § 135), e g, *gaid-y-s* (gen *gaidzio*, euphonic for *gaidio*), "cock," as "singing" (*gied-mi*, "I sing," Sanscrit root *gad*, "to speak"), *rysz-y-s*, "band" (*ryszu*, "I bind"), *tek-y-s*, *tek-i-s*, "ram," ("leaper"), *žyn-y-s*, "sorcerer," ("knowe," *žynnan*, "I know") secondly, feminine bases, and, at the same time, nominatives in *ė*, from *ia*, as *žynė*, "enchantress, witch," as "knowing," *saulė*, "sun, as "shining," though obscured from the point of view of the Lithuanian. From the Old Slavonic we refer here, *медвѣдъ medv-yedy*, "bear," literally, "honey-eater" (theme *-yedyo*, see § 258), which, in Sanscrit form, would be *madh-vadya-s*, (*madhu*, "honey," before vowels *madhu*), and *вождъ voshdy*, "guide" (euphonic for *vody*) *оръ ory*, "horse," leads to the Sanscrit root *ar*, *ṛ*, "to go, to run," whence *áro*, "fast."

904 We return to the Sanscrit future passive participle, in order to notice two other formative suffixes of the same, which likewise find their representatives in the European sister-languages, viz *tavya* and *aníya*. They both require Guna, and the former has the accent either on the first syllable or on the second, in the latter case the *svarita*. The suffix *aníya* always accents the *í*, hence, e g, *yóh-lá-ya-s* (or *-yà-s*) and *yó-janí-ya-s*, "*jungendus*," from *yuy*. To the suffix *tavya* corresponds, in my opinion, in Latin, *tíru* (*síru*), in Greek *τέο* the former has preserved the form, the latter [G. Ed p 1322] the signification, more correctly, yet the

* *Mavya* is, according to its formation, identical with the Sanscrit *mārya*, "*occidendus*," from the causal of the root *mar*, *mr*, "to die" (*mā-áyām*, "I slay," Russian *moryu*, see § 741), but has, in both the passages explained by Burnouf ("Études," pp 188, 240, *passim*), as decidedly an active signification as the only, in signification, causal *bīrč-ya*, "making to grow"

passive signification at least is not entirely lost in the Latin formations and is visible *e g* in *captivus nativus abusivus* (from *abusivus* see § 101) *adjectivus coctivus*. The most true Latinization of *tavya* possible would be *taviu* whence perhaps came next *tiviu* (by the favourite weakening of *a* to *i*) and thence *tivu* so that either the *i* preceding the *v* would be lengthened in compensation for dropping the *i* or the second *i* removed into the preceding syllable and united with its *i* to long *i*. Compare irrespective of the direction of the meaning which the Latin suffix has taken

<i>dativus</i>	with <i>dā tāvya s</i>	<i>dandus</i>
(conjunctivus)	with <i>yōk tāvya s</i>	<i>jungendus</i>
<i>coctivus</i> ,	with <i>pak-tāvya s</i>	<i>coquendus</i>
<i>genitivus</i>	with <i>jan i tāvya s</i>	<i>gignendus</i>

According to its formation *mor tivus* too might be referred to this class as it answers better to the Sanscrit *mar tāvya* (neut. impers *mar tāvya m*) than to *mri tā s* from *mar tu s*. The Greek suffix *τεο* from *τεφο* (for *τεφιο*) as *veo* from *vefo* = नय *nāva novu* answers also with respect to its accent to the Sanscrit proxytone forms of the participle under discussion *e g* *do teo s* to *dā tāvya s dandus* *thc teo-s* to *dhā tāvya s* 'ponendus

905 As in Latin the suffix *tivu* has for the most part assumed an active signification and in Sanscrit the suffix *या* which is contained in the suffix *तव्या* forms not only future passive participles and abstract substantives but also appellatives which according to their fundamental meaning are nouns of agency and correspond to Gothic nouns of agency in *jan* (§ 903 p 1318 G ed) so we might perhaps recognise in the Lithuanian suffix *toya* (nom *toys* see § 135) which forms nouns of agency [G Ed p 1323] a sister form of the Sanscrit *tavya* and look on *toya* as an abbreviation of *tavya*. To this class belong *e g* the bases

class belong in Gothic the masculine neuter [G Ed p 1324] bases *ana laug nya* to conceal *ana siu nya* visible and *ark-nya* holy properly if my conjecture be rightly founded worthy of veneration = Sanscrit *arch aniya* *venerandus* (root *arch* from *ark*)* as above (§ 900) the Greek $\alpha\gamma\iota\omicron\varsigma$ = Sanscrit *yāj ya s* *venerandus* The base *ana laugnya* is arrived at through the secondary base *ana laugnyan* of the weak declension which has proceeded from it whence come the plural neuter *ana laug nyon a* (1 Cor xiv 25) dative *ana laug nya-m* (2 Cor iv 2) On the other hand the strong neuter *analaugn* which occurs twice as nominative and once as accusative is in so far ambiguous as a base *ana laugna* would have the nearest claim on it (see § 153) As however the suppression of the syllable *ya* in the nominative masculine mentioned above (p 1310 G ed) is possible under the same circumstances also in the nominative accusative neuter (see Gab and Lobe p 75) so the forms that have [G Ed p 1320] been mentioned in *yōn a ya m* leave no room for doubt that *ana laug n* stands for *ana laug n* and has *ana laug nya* for its base Just in the same way the weak neuter *anasiu nyō* *visibile* (Skeir ed Massmann 40 21) proves

* Graff too (I 468) refers with respect to the Old High German *erchan* *egregius* to the Sanscrit root *arch* in Anglo Saxon *eorcna stan* signifies 'precious stone' According to the law for the mutation of sounds, we should expect in Gothic *ark nya* for *ark nya* but it has retained the original tenues as *e g* in *sleepa* = Sanscrit *śūp i mi* 'I sleep' (see §§ 20 89) Regarding the radical vowel *ai* for *i* from *a* see § 82 The nominative *arkniz* admits of being quoted but the reading is not quite sure (see Gab and Lobe on 1 Tim iii 3) If we ought to read *arkniz* this might as well come from a base *arkna* as from *arknya* (see p 1310 G ed) The circumstance that the compound *un arkniz* by the plural *un arknaz* (2 Tim iii 2) dative *un arknaim* (1 Tim i 9) clearly refers itself to the base *un arkna* affords no certainty that the theme also of the simple word ends in *na* as it often happens that words are subjected to mutilation in composition

that the strong neuter nominative *anasiu-n*⁷ is an abbreviation of *ana-sui-ni*, and belongs to the base *ana-sui-nya*, which is also confirmed by the adverb *ana-sui-ni-ba*. At the base of all these forms lies *sui* as root, which appears to have been formed from *saihv*, by casting out the *h* and vocalising the euphonic *v* (see § 86) to *u*,[†] while the *a* of the diphthong *ai* was dropped, together with the *h*, to which it owed its existence (see § 82). To the abbreviated root *sui* belongs also the above-mentioned (§ 843) abstract *sui-n(i)s*, "the looking, the regarding," which corresponds to Sanscrit formations like *lú-ni-s*, "the cutting off". From the abstract base *sui-ni*, "the seeing," is found, by the suffix *ya* (see § 903), the derivative masculine base *sui-n'-ya*, "seer," nominative *sui-nei-s*, in the compound *sitba-sui-neis*, "eye witness," literally, "self-seer," *αὐτόπτης*. In Lithuanian we refer to the passive participle under discussion *kans-ni-s*, "a bit," from *kans-nya-s* (from the root *kand*, "to bite"), as also some words which, in the nominative, terminate in *iny-s* (from *inya-s*), e.g., *randiny-s*, "the found" (*randù*, "I find"), *plėsziny-s*, "the fresh-ploughed field" (*plėszu*, "I split, plough"), *pa-suntiny-s*, "envoy" ("mitten-dus," from *sunchiu* from *suntiu*, "I send"), *kretiny-s*, "the [G Ed p 1326] fresh manured field" (*krechiu* from *kretiu*, "I manure"), *mėžiny-s*, "dunghill" (properly, "cleansed out," *mėžu*, *mėžu*, "I cast out the dung"). The *i* preceding the *u*, if it does not belong to the class-syllable, so that throughout a present in *iu* would be to be presupposed, may be taken as the weakening of the *a* of the Sanscrit *anīya*.

* See Gab and Lobe, Grammar, p 75 2) a.

† With respect to the phenomenon, that of the *hv*, for which the Gothic writing has a peculiar letter, only the unessential euphonic affix has remained, compare the relation of our interrogative *wer* ("who") to the Gothic *hva-s* (Sanskrit *ka-s*)

907 As regards the origin of the suffixes *ya tavya* and *aniya* I hold *ya* to be identical with the relative base *ya* (see Influence of the Pronouns on the formation of Words p 26) so that where *ya* forms the future passive participle the passive and future relation is just as little expressed by the suffix as the relation of passive past time or completion by *ta na*. It cannot, therefore surprise us if the suffix *ya* be also applied to the formation of nouns of agency and abstract substantives. Were it limited to the formation of passive participles it would be more suitable to recognise therein the passive character *ya* and to regard, e g the syllable *ya* of भिद्यते *bhid yá t^h finditur*, and भेद्यस् *bhéd ya s findendus* as identical though the difference of accentuation might give some cause for doubt. I agree with Pott (E. I. II 239 and 459) in looking upon the futuro passive participles formed with the suffix *tavya* as offshoots from the infinitive base in *tu*, and accordingly derive, e g कर्तव्या *s faciendus* from the base *kar^htu*,* as I have already before this (see p 728) explained the suffixes *taval natat* which are represented by Indian Grammarians to be present active participles as arising out of the combination of the suffixes *ta na* with the possessive suffix *vat*. Pott l c. in my opinion with justness, regards the participles in *aniya* as springing from the abstracts in *ana* which so frequently supply the place of the infinitive. Consequently the se [G Ed p 1327] condruy suffix *iya* would be contained therein which just like the shorter *ya* sometimes has the meaning worthy as therefore दक्षिण *iya s* or ददक्षिण *ya s* worthy of reward from *dakshinā* (reward especially of Brahmans after the performance of a sacrifice) so e g भेदान *iya s findendus* from *bhédana* the cleaving, पूजन *iya s*

“*honorandus, honore dignus*,” from *páyana*, “the honouring.” The suffix *ya* is perhaps only an extension of *ya*, so that the long vowel which corresponds to the semi-vowel *y* is further prefixed to it. Still more certain is, in my opinion, the proposition that the secondary suffix *vya* set forth by the Indian Grammarians is to be identified with the suffix *ya*, as in the words which are apparently formed with *vya* the *v* easily admits of being explained as a portion of the primary word. Thus, for example, we may suppose a transposition of *bhrátur, pitur* as weakened forms of *bhrátar, pitar*, as in the uninflected genitive of this class of words to *bhrátu, pitru*; and hence, by vocalization of the *r* to *ri*, and change of the *u* into its semi-vowel, on account of the *y* following, deduce *bhrátu-w-yà-s*, “brothers’ offspring,” *pitru-w-yà-s*, “father’s brother,” just as, in Gothic, the plurals of the terms of relationship in *tai, thar*, spring from bases in *tiu, thru* (transposed and weakened from *tar, thar*), so that, e g, *bróthruv-ê*, “*fratrum*” (cf *sunu-ê*, “*filiorum*,” from the base *sunu*), in the portion of it which belongs to the base, approaches very closely the Sanscrit *bhrátu-w-yà-s*. To *pitru-w-yà-s* corresponds (with a diverted signification), as regards the form of the primary word, the Greek *πατρυιός* “stepfather,” and, with respect to formation, also the feminine *μηρυιά*, for which, in Sanscrit, we should have to expect *mátu-w-yà*. Just as, in Sanscrit, we separate the *v* from the suffix, and assign it to the primary word, so we must di-

[G. Ed p 1328] vide, too, the analogous Greek words into *πατρυιός, μηρυιός*, and derive them by transposition from *πατρυ-ιός, μητρυ-ιός* (from *παταρ-ιός, μηταρ-ιός*), as above (§ 253. p. 269, Note †), *πατρά-σι, μητρά-σι*, from *παταρ-σι, μηταρ-σι*. The Zend has, in the above-mentioned (§ 137) *𐬀𐬵𐬰𐬭𐬀 brátur-yé*, avoided transposition. I doubt not, however, that this word, with those in Sanscrit in *tiw-ya*, and the Greek in *τρυ-ιός, -ια*, belong to one class moreover, the *𐬀𐬵𐬰𐬭𐬀 tûryé*, a female relation in the 4th degree (=San-

scribitur *iyā quarta* see § 323 p 152 Note ²) * supports the conjecture mentioned before that the Sanscrit suffix *īya* is only a phonetic extension of the suffix *ya* and therefore the participial termination *aniya* also an extension of *anya* (Zend *nya* and Gothic *nya*) I do not lay any stress for the support of this view on the in classical Sanscrit isolated *īarenya eligendus* (for *īaraniya s*) with which some other analogous Vedic forms class themselves as it scarce admits of any doubt that *īarēnya* = *īarānya* is a transposed form of *īaraniya*, just as in Greek *αμειων* is a transposition of *αμειων* (see § 300 p 402)

908 After having considered the participles infinitives supines gerunds and some formally connected classes of substantives and adjectives we now turn to the description of the remaining classes of words while we treat, in the first place of the naked radical words then of the words formed with suffixes and indeed as regards the Sanscrit according to the following arrangement of the primary suffixes some of which however are at the same time used as secondary *i.e.* for derivations from nominal bases

PRIMARY SUFFIXES | [G Ed p 1329]

a fem <i>ā</i> or <i>ī</i>	<i>vya</i> see <i>ya</i> p 1327 G ed
i	<i>na</i> fem <i>nā</i> §§ 836 838 842
u	<i>ni</i> §§ 843 851
an	<i>nu</i> <i>snu</i>

* In the original a misprint occurs here which might give some trouble to the German reader We have § 462 for p 462 Owing to mistakes of this kind I have in several places been unable to verify the references —
Translator's Note

† I admit into this catalogue the suffixes of the participles also, which have been already discussed with a reference to the paragraphs adverted to Such suffixes however as neither reappear in the European sister languages, nor are of importance as regards the Sanscrit itself, I leave unnoticed

<i>m</i>	<i>nt, ant, t, at, §§ 779, 782 ; anta,</i>
<i>ana</i>	<i>§. 809. p 1091, Note.</i>
<i>anīya, see ya</i>	<i>ma, § 805.</i>
<i>āna, §§. 791., 792.</i>	<i>mī</i>
<i>as</i>	<i>man, §. 795</i>
<i>us</i>	<i>māna, §§ 791., 792.</i>
<i>is</i>	<i>ka, aka, āka, ika, uka</i>
<i>ya, tavya, anīya*</i>	<i>ta, fem. tū, §§. 820., 829., tātī, §. 832</i>
<i>ra, ira, ura, ēra, ōra</i>	<i>tūr, tī, § 810.</i>
<i>la, ala, ila, ula</i>	<i>tī, §§ 843, 844, 849.; a-ti, § 819</i>
<i>va</i>	<i>tu f., §. 851., tu, m. n, atu, athu</i>
<i>van</i>	<i>tīa, fem trā, a-tra, i-tra, §. 818.</i>
<i>vas, vāns, vat, ush, §. 788.</i>	<i>tva, §§. 831, 835</i>

909. Naked radical words appear in Sanscrit -

a) as feminine abstracts, *e g*, *anu-jñā*, "command;" *bhī*, "fear," *hrī*, "shame," *tvīṣh*, "lustre;" *yudh*, "strife," *kshudh*, "hunger," *mud*, "joy," *sam-pád*, "luck," *bhās*, "lustre" To this class belong the above-mentioned (§§ 857, [G Ed p 1330] 859) Vêdic infinitives with a dative or accusative termination from bases which otherwise have left behind no case A medial *a* is, in some formations of this kind, lengthened; hence, *e g*, *vāch*, "the speaking," "speech," from *vach* So also in Zend *vāch*, "speech," and *fīās*, "question" (Sanskrit root *prachh*)

b) At the end of compounds in the sense of the present participles, where the substantive preceding usually stands in the accusative relation, or simply as appellatives, which, according to their fundamental meaning, are nouns of agency. The following are examples. *dharma-víd*, "acquainted with duty," *ari-hán*, "slaying foes," *duhkha-hán*, "removing pain,"

* See §§. 889, 891, 894, 899, 901, 906.

* *akshī*, "eye," and Latin *ŏculus* *Pác*, "peace," from a lost root, probably means originally "joining," as a derivative of the Sanscrit root *paś* (from *pak*)

911. To the class of words (*b*) in §. 909 correspond Greek bases like *χέρ-νιβ* (properly, "washing hands"), *ἀρχυρο-τριβ*, *παιδο-τριβ*, *πρός-φυγ*, *ψευσσι-στυγ*, *κορυθ-αικ*, *βου-πλήγ*, *γλαγο-πήγ*. In the two last examples, and other combinations with *πλήγ*, the length of the final syllable appears to have thrust down the accent from its former position, and thus to have occasioned an accidental agreement with the Sanscrit accentuation of this class of words (*dharma-víd*, &c), which I do not regard as original, so in *-ρώγ* (*διαρρώγ*, *καταρρώγ*, *περιρρώγ*), with a passive signification, whereby, too, *-ζυγ* (in *δίζυγ*, *νεοζυγ*, *μελανοζυγ*, &c), and the Latin base *jug* (*conjug*) answers to the Sanscrit *-yúg*, "yoked." To the simple base *द्वृ* *dvish*, "foe," as "hating," corresponds *τρωγ*, "gnawer, devourer," and the Latin *duc*, as masculine, "guide," as feminine, "she that guides," as also *rég*, "king," as "ruling," the Sanscrit sister form of which, *ráj*, appears only in

[G Ed p 1332.] compounds, as *dharma-ráj*, "king of righteousness." Observe the lengthening of the radical vowel in the Latin *rég* (opposed to *rěgo*), after the analogy of the Sanscrit *pari-vráj*, "beggar" ("wanderer around"); while the radical vowel of the Sanscrit *ráj* is, from its origin, long. We mention further, as examples of Latin radical words at the end of compounds, *arti-fic*, *carni-fic*, *pel-lic*, *in-dic*, *jú-dic*, *ob-ic*, *Pol-líc*, *for-cip*, *mān-cip*, *priin-cip*, *au-cup*, *præ-sid*, *in-cúld*. The latter answers, by its passive signification ("anvil," as that which is struck upon), to *jug* in *con-jug*, Greek *-ζυγ*, and Sanscrit *-yug*, "yoked." In most of the remaining examples the *i* rests on the weakening of an original *a*, and the *e*, which enters into the

* I regard the verbal root *इक्ष्* *iksh*, "to see," as a corruption of *aksh*

nominative in its stead on the principle laid down in § 6 *Sid* in *præ sid* is identical with the Sanscrit *shad* in *divi-shud* (euphonic for *sad*) sitting in heaven dwelling there" *cœlicola* a so far anomalous compound inasmuch as the first member of it is provided with a case termination* *Au cup* exhibits the intermediate weakening of the vowel which otherwise only occurs before *l* (cf § 490 Rem 1) and which therefore finds a more suitable place in *præ sul consul* (from *salio* Sanscrit *sal* to move oneself)

912 With the *t* which in Sanscrit (according to § 909 *b*) is added to roots with a short final vowel the Latin *t* of *-it* going and *stit* (as weakening of *stat*) in *super stit anti stit* has been already (§ 111 sub fin) contrasted and since then Pott has also compared that in *pari-et* † properly going around surrounding (as above *pari srul* flowing around") and Curtius that in *indi get* (cf [G Ed p 1333] *indi gena*) ‡ The Greek adds such a *t* to roots with a long final vowel (see Curtius l c) in compounds like *ανδρο βρωτ ωμο βρωτ, α γιωτ α πωτ λυμο θνητ* The terminations *βλητ δμητ κμητ τμητ στρωτ (φυλλοστρωτ)* have only a passive signification which in Sanscrit does not occur in compounds of this kind while *βρωτ* and *-γιωτ* are used both actively and passively As regards the vowel of these formations it rests for the most part on transposition which

* The circumstance that the Latin *e* corrupted from *a*, becomes *i* when the word is encumbered by composition, excepting when it stands under the protection of two consonants or in a final syllable, proves that in Latin the *i* is held to be lighter than the inorganic short *e*

* † Euphonic for *pari it*

‡ *De nominum Græc formatione* p 10 With respect to the dropping of the *n* in the root *gen* cf the Sanscrit *j a for jan a* born and with regard to the appended *t* the phenomenon that in Sanscrit the roots in *an* and *am* in case they reject their *n* before the gerundial suffix *ya* then add, like roots with a short final vowel a *t* hence *e g ni há t ya* from *han* ' to slay

is readily occasioned by liquids, and lengthening, where it is to be noticed that η and ω , according to their origin, = \bar{a} (see §. 4), and that in Sanscrit such transpositions occur, since, e.g., together with *man*, "to think," there occurs a root *mná*, "to mention" (cf. *μιμνήσκω*, fut *μνή-σω*), together with *dham* "to blow" (only in the special tenses), occurs a form *dhmá*, which the Grammarians assume to be the original one. The roots *πτω* (cf. *πίπτω* from *πιπέτω*), *δμη* (cf. *δομάω*), *θνη* (cf. *ἔθانون*, *θάνατος*), *κμη* (cf. *κάμνω*), *στρω* (cf. *στόρνυμι*, Latin *sterno*), guide us to the Sanscrit roots *pat*, "to fall," *dam*, "to tame," *han* (from *dhan*), "to slay," *śram* (from *kram*), *klam*, "to be tired," *star*, *स्तृ* *stí*, "to strew" If concrete bases then, like *-βρώτ*, *-γνώτ*, with euphonic *t*, represent the Sanscrit naked radical words like *-pá*, "drinking," then, irrespective of gender, the abstracts *γέλωτ* and *ἔρωτ* may be compared with the Sanscrit abstracts like *anu-jñá*, "com-
[G Ed p 1334] mand," for though the ω of the said Greek bases is not radical, it nevertheless belongs to the verbal theme, and, like *ao* in *ἐρ-áo-μαι*, *γελ-áo-μεν*, represents the Sanscrit character *aya* of the 10th class (§ 109^a 6) In departure, too, from a former opinion (§ 116), I find this latter in the form of \bar{a} or η in compounds like *λογο-θήρā-s*, *ἰκνο-νώμā-s*, *ὄπλο-μάχη-s*, *πολυ νίκη-s*, *ἐλαιο-πώλη-s*. Compare the base *-θήρā* with *θηρā-σω*, *θηρā-τωρ*, *-νώμā* with *νωμή-σω* from *νωμά-σω*, *-νίκη* with *νική-σω*, *νική-τωρ*, *-μάχη* with *μαχή-σομαι*, *μαχή-της*, *μαχή-μων* *Τρίβης* in *παιδο-τρίβης*, *φαρμακο-τρίβης*, can hardly spring from the root *τριβ* with a

* Here belongs the Latin *quíet* (also *quíe*), which has remained true to the feminine gender, and the root of which, *qui*=Sanskrit *śi* (from (*hí*), has united itself with the character *é* of the 2d conjugation (=Sanskrit *aya*, *ay*, see § 109^a 6), for which I hold the *é* of *qui-é-vi*, *qui-é-tus* Cf *im-pl-é-vi*, *im-pl-é-tus*, *im-pl-é-s*, *im-pl-é-mus*, *im-pl-é-tis* The three last forms, irrespective of the preposition, correspond to the Sanscrit *pār-áya-si*, *pār-áyā-mas*, *pār-áya-tha*, of the causal of the root *par* (*पृ* *prí*), "to fill," the vowel of which is passed over in Latin

suffix η , but is rather n naked verbal base and presupposes a derivative verb $\tau\rho\iota\beta\epsilon\omega$ future $\tau\rho\iota\beta\eta\sigma\omega$. In the formations in $i\bar{a}$ ς I think I recognise the Sanscrit root $y\acute{a}$ to go * which actually occurs in the Veda dialect in compounds of the kind described above (p 1330 G ed) $e g$ in $d\acute{e}va y\acute{a}$ nominative $d\acute{e}va y\acute{a} \varsigma$ going to the gods," $r\acute{ina}-y\acute{a} \varsigma$ going into debt = taking guilt on oneself atoning freeing from guilt (see Benfey's Glossary) In Greek, therefore $e g$ $\alpha\lambda\omega\pi\epsilon\kappa\iota\alpha \varsigma$ foxy literally signifies, approaching the nature of the fox and $\lambda\alpha\mu\pi\alpha\delta\iota\alpha \varsigma$ torch carrier properly going with the torch

913 If we now proceed to consider [G Ed p 1330] the words formed with suffixes we must, with reference to the secondary suffixes which by the Indian Grammarians are called Taddhita bring to remembrance the already frequently mentioned circumstance that the final vowels of primitive bases are in all the Indo European languages under certain restrictions † suppressed before suffixes beginning with vowels or the semi vowel y . With reference to Sanscrit and Zend it is to be remarked that certain secondary classes of words require the Vriddhi increment (see § 26) for the first vowel of the primary word hence $e g$ $d\acute{a}sarath \iota \varsigma$ (from $dasarat'ha$) ‡ descen

* Cf $\epsilon\eta\mu\iota$, with causal signification ('making to go') probably a reduplicated form from y $y\eta\mu\iota$ as $\iota\sigma\tau\eta\mu\iota$ from $\sigma\iota\sigma\tau\eta\mu\iota$ so that the semi vowel in the syllable of reduplication has become the rough breathing (cf $o \varsigma = yu \varsigma$ § 382) and in the root itself is suppressed as, $e g$, in the verbs in $a\omega$ = Sanscrit $a\acute{d}mi$

† See § 891

‡ a is held to be the Vriddhi of α to which latter the Indian Grammarians assign no Guna. Moreover α as it is the heaviest vowel (see § 6) feels less occasion for increment and remains in most cases unchanged while other vowels are gunised. Sometimes also \acute{a} is found for α in places where other vowels experience the Guna increment. As both $\alpha + \alpha$ and $\acute{a} + \alpha$ are contracted to α it might be said that \acute{a} is both the

Guna

dant of Daśaratha," and in Zend, *ahur'-ya* (from *ahura*, see § 41), "Ahurish" "referring to Ahura," *zair'-i*, "golden," from *zairi*, "gold" In Gothic, *-dōg'-s*, "daily" (theme *dōga*, see §. 135), offers a similar relation to its primitive base *daga*, nominative *dag'-s*, "day," as *ō*, according to § 69, is the most usual representative of the length of the *a*. According to the principles of Sanscrit, we must assume that the adjective base *dōga*, which occurs only in the compound *fidurdōga*, "of four days" (nom *fidurdōg'-s*), is formed from the sub-
[G Ed p 1336] stantive base *daga*, in such wise that the final vowel of the latter is suppressed before the derivative suffix *a* in the same way as, *e g*, in Sanscrit, that of *संवत्सर* *sanvatsara*, "year," is suppressed before the Taddhita suffix *a* contained in *संवत्सर-आ* *sānvatsar'-ā*, "yearly," while apparently *sānvatsara*, "yearly," seems to be formed from *sanvatsara*, "year" by simply lengthening the first vowel of the primary word. The Lithuanian, too, the *o* of which is always long, and frequently represents the Sanscrit *ā*, exhibits, in some derivative words, *o* in the place of the *a* of the primitive base, thus, *plót'-i-s*, "breadth" (theme *plotya*), comes from *platú-s*, "broad," and *lób'-i-s*, "riches" (theme *lobya*), from *labá-s*, "rich," in the same way as, in Sanscrit, *e g*, *mádhur-ya-m*, "sweetness," from *madhurá*, "sweet" * As in Latin, also, *ō* frequently stands for original *ā*, *e g*, *sorórem* = Sanscrit *svásāram*, we might recognise in *ōv'-u-m* a remnant of the Vriddhi increment,

Guna and the Vriddhi increment of *a*, that, however, Guna takes place with *a* more seldom than with the lighter vowels *u* and *i*

* See §§. 891, 893 If, in Lithuanian, in this class of words a primitive *a* of the base word does not pass into *o*, perhaps the length of position protects the original *a* hence, in the examples mentioned above (§ 893), *karsztis*, "best," *szaltis*, "cold," not *korsztis*, *szoltis* In general, I know hitherto of no example in which *a* stands before a simple consonant in an abstract of this kind.

which the Sanscrit Grammar requires when with the suffix *a* to which the *u* of the Latin 2d declension corresponds a derivative is formed with the secondary idea of springing from *e g* *sāmudr á-m* sea salt as that which springs from the sea (*samudrá* nom -*rá s*) There fore as the neuter *sāmudr á-m* may be explained as coming from the masculine base *samudrá* with the suppression of the final vowel before the derivative suffix *a* so I think I may venture to explain *ov u-m* as offspring of the bird from *au s* In Sanscrit it would be quite regular, if *au* instead of *u* signified a bird to find an *av a m* coming from it is a term for an egg The Greek *ωοι* from *ωφ οι* which as respects its accentuation [G Ed p 1337] also answers to the Sanscrit class of words here spoken of has lost its primitive * on the other hand exclusive of gender and accent *ῶα* (from *ῶφα*) sheep-skin fur stands in a relation to its primitive base *ῶι* from *ῶφι* (Sanskrit *áui* sheep) similar to that which the Latin *ov um* for *av um* holds to *au* †

* In the form *ωιο-ν* for *ωφ ον* I do not regard the *ο* as the retained final vowel of the primary word but recognise in *ωο* the Sanscrit suffix *ya* which just like *a*, forms personal and neuter patronymics

† In *νημεῖς* I cannot recognise an accord to the Sanscrit Viddhi increment of the secondary formation of words as I do not derive it from *νemos*, but from *νιμος* (in Hesych), the base of which is also found in some compounds (*η ἐμόφωνος ην μόφ ιτο s*) Moreover the Sanscrit suffix which corresponds to the Greek *ει* requires no Viddhi increment Just as little in Sanscrit, in compounded words does a vowel lengthening of this kind occur like that which the Greek exhibits in some compounds especially in those with prepositions and monosyllabic prefixes and bases of words, or those which become monosyllabic by the suppression of their final vowel and which takes place in order perhaps to bring forward more emphatically after such weak preceding syllables the principal part of the word in case it begins with a vowel hence, *e g* *δυσηκ στ s* (*ε εστ s*) *δυσηκης* (*ος*) *δυσηνυτος δυσηνυσος* (*ωις s*) *δ σηπς* (for *δ σερ s*) *δυσω λεθρος* (**λεθρος*) *δυωλυμ s* (*ν μα*) *ηετμ s* (*ρ τς os*) *ε ηκης* (*εκς*) *ηνυστ s*

[G Ed. p 1338] 914 The Sanscrit primary suffix *a*, which, as also the secondary, I hold to be identical with the demonstrative base *a* (see § 366), has, together with its sister-forms in the cognate languages, been already considered (see p 1235 G ed) as the formative suffix of masculine abstracts. In Gothic, most of the abstracts which, in respect of their suffix, belong to this class, have become neuter, and terminate, therefore, in the nominative singular, with the final consonant of the root (see § 135). The following are nearly all of them *anda-beit*, "blame"* , *anda-hait*, "avowal," *bi-hait*, "strife," *ga-hait*, "promise" (formally our "*Geheiss*," "behest"), *af-lét*, "forgiveness," *bi-mait*, "clipping," *bi-faih*, "delusion," *fia-veit*, "revenge," *ana-filh*, "delivery," from the bases *anda-beta*, *ga-heita*, &c. As regards the radical vowel of these abstracts, what has been observed above (p 1237, Note) holds good. We must not, therefore, derive the base *anda-néma*, "acceptance," the gender of

εὐήνυστος (ἀνυστός), εὐήνωρ (ἀνήρ), εὐώδης (root ὠδ), εὐώνυμος, ἀνήμεστος - ἀνηκής (ἄκος), ἀνήκουστος (ἀκουστός), ἀνώδυνος (ὀδύνη), ἐνήκοος (ἀκοή), ἐνήλατον (ἐνελάυνω), ἐνώμοτος (ὄμνυμι), προσήγορος (ἀγορεύω), περιώδυνος, τριήρης, μονήρης, ποδήρης, ποδώνυχος, πανήγορις, τανάλεθρος. I moreover recall attention to the fact, that in Sanscrit the Viddhi increment of the secondary formation of words supplies the place of the Guna increment of the primary, thus as, *e g*, *bódh-a s*, "the knowing," and *bódh-ā-mi*, "I know," come from the root *budh*, so *báuddh-a-s*, "Buddhist," comes from *buddhá*, "Buddha," as adjective, "knowing, wise." That the secondary formation of words, in as far as the class of words referred to in general requires an augment, calls for Viddhi instead of Guna, may well arise from this, that the base words to which the secondary suffixes are attached are of themselves more heavily constructed than the naked roots, whence arise the primitive nouns or verbs. Hence, in the secondary formation of words, long vowels, and even Guna diphthongs and short vowels before two consonants, are augmented, for which the primary formation of words, except when the root ends in a vowel, feels no occasion.

* The base *anda-beta* is, after removing the preposition, identical with the above-mentioned (p 1235 G ed) Sanscrit *bhēda*, "cleaving"

which however is not discoverable from the solitary genitive that can be quoted *codā nemi* s (see § 191) from the plural of the preterite (*nemur*) but we must view it as coming like the adjective theme *andā n i ya* (see p 178 G ed. Note) which corresponds to the Sanscrit future passive participle from the root *nam* the radical vowel being lengthened in accordance with Sanscrit abstracts like *lāsa* s the "longing" from *har* I know in Sanscrit but one single neuter abstract of this class of word viz. *bhaya* m "fear" from *bhī* to fear which like the analogous masculine abstracts [6 11 p 170] from roots in *i* or *ī* as *cj jaya* s "victory" from *ji* *lśhaya*-a s "ruin" from *lśhī* *kraya*-a s "purchase" from *krī* has allowed the accent to sink down on the suffix.

915. Oxytone too are for the most part the adjectives formed with *α α* with the signification of the present participle and the appellatives in *α* which belong to this class and which according to their fundamental meaning are for the most part nouns of agency e.g. *nub-a* s "river" as "sounding, rushing" *plū-a* s "vessel" as "swimming" (root *plū*) *dant-a* s "tooth" as "biting" *dē-ī* s "God" as "shining" (root *dit* cf *θεός*) *muth-a* s "moon" as "shining" *clur-a* s "thief" (root *clur* to steal) The following are examples of adjectives *clal-a* s "rocking, treacherous" *clur-a* s "going" *trav-ās* "trembling" *lśham-a* s "enduring" *prī-ās* "loving and beloved" (root *prī*) *val-a* s "carrying, bringing" This oxytone class of words in *α* = Greek *ο* in opposition to the abstracts which choose the more powerful accentuation is also numerously represented in Greek both by appellatives or nouns of agency, as *τροχ-ος*, "runner" (opposed to *τροχ-ος* "course") *κομτ-ος* "braggard" (opposed to *κομτ-ος* "noise") *κλστ-ος* *κομτ-ος* *μορχ-ος* * and by adjective as *,αι-ος* *τομ-ος* *θο-ος* *αρωγ-ος*

* It corresponds in its root and primary meaning as also in formation and accentuation to the Sanscrit *mlh d s*, "cloud" as "raining" (root *mlh* "mingere")

ἀγωγ-ό-ς, στιλβ-ό-ς, and some with a passive signification, λοιπ-ό-ς, κυφ-ό-ς, πηγ-ό-ς, αἰθ-ό-ς. So the substantives λοιπ-ό-ς, "shell," as "to be peeled off," ὁδ-ό-ς, "way," as "to be gone, to be trod" (Sanskrit root *sad*, "to go," and "to seat one-self") In Sanscrit, too, there are substantives of this kind with a passive signification, as, *e g*, *dar-á-s*, neut *dar-á-m*, "a hollow," as "being cleft," *léh-á-s*, "food," as "to be licked," *jan-á-s*, "man," as "born." The following accent the root *édh-a-s* (opposed to the Greek αἰθ-ό-ς), "wood," as "to be burned" (root *indh*, properly, *idh*), *véś-a-s*, "house," as "place entered" (Greek οἶκ-ο-ς from *Foîk-o-s*, Latin *víc-u-s*, Old High German *wîh*, theme *wîha*, "village, borough," from an obsolete root) To the feminine bases of this class of words belong, in Greek, bases also in *αδ*, of which the *δ* is only an inorganic affix (see p. 109), *e g*, *δορκ-άδ*, "gazel," as "seeing" (also *δόρκη*), *μοιχάδ* (*μοιχή*), as feminine, from *μοιχό*, *τοκάδ*, "the bearing (female)", *πλω(F)άδ*, *πλω(F)άδ*, "the swimming, the wandering around (female)", *τυπάδ*, "hammer," as "striking."

916 In Sanscrit, as well as in Greek, adjectives of this kind of formation occur principally at the end of compounds, and in both languages have partly either not been retained in isolated use, or have, perhaps, never been used simply Thus, in Sanscrit, *damá*, "taming," appears only in the compound *arin-damá-s*, "foe-taming," and the corresponding Greek *δαμο* only in *ἱππόδαμο-ς* So, in Latin, *-dic-u-s*, *-loqu-u-s*, *-fic-u-s*, *-fug-u-s*, *-sequ-u-s*, *-vol-u-s*, *-cub-u-s* (*incubus*), *-leg-u-s*, *-vor-u-s*, *-fer*, *-ger* (for *fer-u-s*, *ger-u-s*),

* *Arin*, euphonic for *árim*, is the accusative, which occurs also in many other compounds of this kind, in which the first member usually stands in the accusative relation instead of the naked theme which was to be expected according to the universal rules of composition, *e g*, in *puan-dar-á-s*, "towns-cleaving" (literally, "*ubem findens*"), *prayan-vada-s*, "amiably-speaking," *bhayan-kara-s*, "fear-causing"

par u s (*ouparus*) *liqu u s* (*re liqu u s* = Greek $\lambda\omicron\iota\pi\omicron\varsigma$)
frag u s (*naufragus*) The following perhaps are the sole
 examples which occur simply *sci u s* *vag u s* *fid u s* *parc u s*
 These substantives belong to this class *coqu u s* (= Sanscrit
pach á s from *pak-á s* cooking) *merg u s* *proc u s* (cf *pre*
cor) *son u s* as sounding = Sanscrit *śān* [G Ed p 1341]
á s tone *jug u m* *lad u m* (properly passed through
 as above दारु *dar á m* a hollow as cleft) and perhaps
tor u s from *storus* as spread out * To this class also
 are to be referred the feminines *mola* mill as grinding
 and *toga* as covering † The *a* of compounds like *parricida*
cælicola *advena* *collega* *transfuga* *legitima* *indigena* I now in
 departure from § 116 rather prefer viewing in such a way
 as to recognise in it a distinct feminine form and therefore
 the Sanscrit long *ā* of forms like *prīyavādā*, the amiably
 speaking (female) which at the same time stands for the
 masculine while conversely the Greek at the end of com
 pounds by a mis usage transfers the masculine neuter *o* =
 Sanscrit short *a* into the feminine also and contrasts *e g*
 the form $\mu\lambda\upsilon\kappa\omicron\mu\omicron\varsigma$ with the Latin *multicoma* since as it ap
 pears to me the burthen of composition is an obstacle in
 the way of the free movement and liability to change of the
 entire word on which account its concluding portion relinqu
 quishes the exact discrimination of the genders ‡

With respect to the loss of the *s* of *ster no* $\sigma\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\varsigma$ *no* cf the rela
 tion of *tonare* to the Sanscrit root *stan* to thunder and Greek $\sigma\tau\epsilon\nu$
 in $\Sigma\tau\epsilon\nu\tau\omega\mu$

† In Latin the interchange of the sounds *e* and *o* in one and the same
 root occurs but seldom and the etymology in the cases which occur
 is obscured while in Greek it is self evident that *e g* $\phi\omicron\rho\varsigma$ and $\phi\rho\omega$
 are radically identical

‡ The circumstance that as well in the Greek as in the Latin 2d de
 clension there are simple feminines such as $\pi\rho\omicron\varsigma$ $\delta\epsilon\varsigma$ $\nu\eta\sigma\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ *alvus*
humus (Sanskrit *bhūmī s* fem 'earth') *fagus* (= $\phi\eta\gamma\omicron\varsigma$) does not im
 pede the supposition that the Greek and Latin inorganic *u* of the 2d
 declension

[G Ed p 1342] 917 The Gothic exhibits, in the class of words under discussion, (1) masculine substantive bases like *daw-a-vard-a*, "gatekeeper," *vrah-a*, "persecutor,"* *vég-a*, "wave," as "moving itself"†, *vig-a*, "way" (as "the place on which one moves"), *thiv-a*(nom. *thiu-s*), "servant"‡

declension do not originally belong to the feminine, as also the corresponding Sanscrit, Zend, Lithuanian, and Gothic *a*, and Slavonic *o*, never stand at the end of a feminine base. That, however, conversely, the Latin *a* at the end of compounds like *cali-cola* does not correspond to the Sanscrit-Zend masculine neuter *a* may here be further supported by the consideration that compounds are most subject to weakening, and that, therefore, the retention of the Sanscrit masculine neuter *a* unchanged in Latin can least be expected in compounds. But if the feminine form in compounds like *paricida* has once found its way into the masculine, or attached itself to this gender alone (*calicula*), it cannot surprise us that, in an isolated case, a simple word appears in the feminine form as masculine, viz *scrib-a* for *scrib-u-s*. The case is different with *nau-ta*, where *ta* stands for *τη-s*, as in *poula*=*ποιητής*, and as in Homer, *e g*, *αἰχμητά, νεφεληγερέτα, ἱππότα, ἡπύτα, ἡχέτα, μητιέτα*, for *αἰχμητής, &c*. Here either the case-sign has been dropped, as in Old Persian is regularly the case with the final *s* both after short and long *a*, or, which I prefer assuming, these forms are based on the Sanscrit nominatives in *tā*, Zend *ta* (see § 144), of bases in *tār*, on which rest, in Greek, not only the bases in *τηρ* and *τορ*, as has already been remarked in § 145, but also the masculine bases in *τη*=*τᾱ*, which have lost an *ρ* (see also § 810, and Curtius, "*De nominum Græc form*," p 34). It is therefore no casual circumstance, that in the Homeric dialect nearly all the class of nouns of agency referred to exhibit masculine nominatives in *a*, and it is hence not improbable that *ἐπρύ-στα*, too, originally belongs to this class of words, and is therefore abbreviated from *ἐπρυοστα*, as, according to its meaning, it is a noun of agency.

* The nominative *vrah-s*, which can alone be quoted, might also belong to a base *vrahi*.

† This answers, in respect of the lengthening of the radical vowel *a* to *ē* (= *ā*, see § 69), to Sanscrit formations like *pād-a-s*, "foot," as "going," from *pad*, "to go."

‡ In my opinion properly "boy," from a root *thav*=Sanskrit *tu*, "to grow," as, *mag-ā-s*, "boy," from *mag*=Sanskrit *mah, manh*, "to grow." From

(*zwanú*, "I sound,"); *ták-a-s*, "footpath" (*tekù*, "I run,"); *wend-a-s*, "face, visage," as "seeing" (*weizd-mi*, "I see,"

[G Ed p 1311] *waidino-s*, "I let myself see,"): *-nink-a-s*, which, at the end of compounds, has often a meaning tantamount to "maker, accomplisher," or one who is occupied with that which the first member of the compound expresses, as, *baln-nink-a-s*, "saddler, saddle-maker" (*balna-s*, "saddle,"); *grěkti-nink-a-s*, "sinner, sin-committing" (*grěka-s*, "sin,"); *lauki-nink-a-s*, "countryman, agriculturist, *agruola*" (*lauka-s*, "field,"); *miěsi-nink-a-s*, "butcher, *carner*" (*miśsà*, f, Sanscrit *mānsú*, m. n "flesh,"); *darbi-nink-a-s*, "workman, doing work" (*darba-s*, "work,"); *remesti nink-a-s*, "artisan, working at a craft" (*remesta-s*, "handicraft,") Observe the weakening of the final vowel of the first member of all

* The base verb *ninku* does not occur in its simple form, but only in combination with the prepositions *in*, *ap*, *uz*, and *u* (see Nesselmann's Lexicon, p 422), and probably meant originally "to go," then "to do, to make" Cf the Old Prussian *neik-aut*, "to wander," and Russian *nik-mi*, "I bow myself" To the Lithuanian *-ni-ka-s*, in the compounds spoken of, corresponds, in Russian, *никъ nik*, e. g, in *сѣдѣльникъ syedily-nik*, "saddler," i. e. "saddle-maker" The Old Prussian appears to form with *nika* (nom *ni* for *nika-s*, acc *nika-n*) nouns of agency from verbal bases (see Nesselmann, p 76) I regard, however, all the words classed here as compounds, similar to the Latin *opifer*, *artifici*, for although, e. g, *waldnux*, "ruler," of which only the dative *walduku* occurs, might be derived from the verbal root *wald*, "to rule," still nothing prevents the assumption that it properly signifies "using authority," and contains a lost or unciteable substantive *wald-s* or *walda-s* (theme *walda*), "dominion" *Cruti*, the substantive base of *crut-ni*, "baptist" ("performer of baptism"), occurs in the compound *cruti-lauka-s*, "baptismal register," and the substantive base *dila* (acc *dila-n*), in *dil-nik-a-s*, "workman, performing work" (acc pl), and for *daina-alge-nik-a-mans*

† This answer day labourers, those working for daily pay," occur the to *é* (= *â*, see uses *dema*, "day" (Sanskrit *dina*), and *alga*, "pay" (gen "going," from *pi* verb of which the word referred to could be the noun of

‡ In my opinion this is the case with most of the other formations which grow, as, *mā*, class

these compounds to *r* according to the principle of the Latin language as *cæli-cola terræ-cola fructu-fer* [G Ed p 1310] *lani-ger* for *cælu-cola terra-cola fructu-fer lana-ger** The following are examples of adjectives of this kind of formation *gyic a s* living *at-uir a s* open (*at ueru* I open) *át-rak-a s* unlocked (*rak inu* I lock *at-rak inu* I unlock), *isz-tis a s* stretched out (*tesiu* I erect) To this class of words belong in old Slavonic bases like *rol o toko* river as flowing *pro-roko* prophet *orçol o ot roko* 'boy properly *infans* *ιηπιος* (Mikl Rad p 74) *ποδοφορο* *podonoso* 'hydria' properly water-carrier 'nom *τοκτο* *tok &c* The following are examples with a passive signification *გრადი* *grad* 'town' as enclosed (*grad i ti* to enclose) *მილ* *mil* 'dear (beloved) pleasant, as in Sanscrit *pur-á m u pur i f* 'town' as filled *प्रिय á s* 'beloved' (root *pri*)

919 Between the Sanscrit and Greek there exists the remarkable coincidence that the adjectives formed with the suffix under discussion in combination with the prefixes *सु* *su* *cv* light *दुस्* *dus* † *δυσ* heavy most generally if not in Sanscrit invariably, have a passive signification ‡ The accent in Sanscrit rests on the radical syllable *e g* *subhár a s* being lightly made light to make *subh a s* being* easily attained, *dushkár a s* [G Ed p 1346] being made heavy hard to do *durlábh a s* being with

* See § 6 and 'Vocalismus pp 139 16' Note * With respect to the Lithuanian *senator* I must however in departure from § 6 (conclusion) remark that here the *s* is not the weakening of the *a* of *pona s* lord but the contraction of the suffix *ya* or *ia* according to § 130

† Hence according to settled laws of sound and according to the measure of the letters following *dush dur duh*

‡ These forms cannot be allowed to weigh as exceptions in which *su* does not signify 'light,' but has a meaning tantamount to "fair, good, pleasant, *e g* Rígv I 112 2 *subhára* bringing fair (load)

difficulty (heavily) attained," *duhsáhi-a-s*, "being heavy to bear," *duimársh-a-s*, id., *durdháish-a-s*, "being heavily pressed," *dushpáhi-a-s*, "being heavily filled," *dushtár-a-s* (euphonic for *dustái-a-s*), "being with difficulty (heavily) overstepped." So in Greek, *e g*, *εὐφορ-ο-ς*, *εὐκάτοχ-ο-ς*, *εὐπερίγραφ-ο-ς*, *εὐέμβολ-ο-ς*, *εὐανάγωγ-ο-ς*, *δύσφορ-ο-ς*, *δύστροφ-ο-ς*, *δύστομ-ο-ς*, *δύσπλο-ο-ς*, *δυσπρόσμαχ-ο-ς*, *δυσανάπορ-ο-ς*

920 As secondary (Taddhita) suffix *a* in Sanscrit forms, usually with the accent and Vriddhi of the first vowel of the primary word (1) Masculine substantives (with feminines in *i*), which stand to the primary word in the relation of derivatives, or in any other relationship, as, *e g*, *vásishth'-á-s*, from *vásishtha*, "descendant of Vasishtha," *mānav-á-s*, (from *manú*) "man," as "descendant of Manu," *dráupad'-i*, (from *drupada*) "Dráupadī, daughter of Dīn-pada," *dāuhit'-á-s*, (from *dūhitāi*, *-tī*) "son of the daughter," *nāishadh'-á-s*, "Naiṣhadha," from *nshadha*, in the plural, "the country Nishadha," *śárv'-á-s*, (from *śíva*) "follower, worshipper of Śiva" (2) A kind of patronymics of things by which, *e g*, fruits are called after the trees on which they grow, and are represented, as it were, as their sons, *e g*, *áśvatth'-á-m*, (from *áśvattha*) "the fruit of the tree Áśvattha" To this class belongs also the already-mentioned *sā-mudr'-á-m*, "sea-salt," as "that which is produced from the sea" (*samudra*) (3) Abstract neutrals, as, *yáuvan-á-m*, "youth," from *yuvan*, "young" (4) Neuter collectives, as, *lāpól'-á-m*, "a flock of doves," from *lapōla* (5) Adjectives and appellatives having various relationships to the primary word, *e g*, *ráyat'-á-s*, "of silver," from *rayatá-m*, "silver," *áyas-á-m*, "of iron," from *áyas* (theme and nom = Latin *aes*, *aer-is*, [G Ed p 1347] from *aes-is*, Gothic *aiz*, theme *aiza*), *sāukar'-á-s*, "porcine," from *sūkara*, "swine," *sānvatsar'-á-s*, "yearly," from *sanvatsara*, "year," *dváip'-á-s*, "a car covered with tiger-skin," as adjective, "made of tiger-skin," from *dvīpa*, *m n* (*dvīpa-s*, *-a -m*), "tiger-skin"

921 To class (1) and indeed to the feminine patronymics like *dráupad* : *Draupadā* (from *drupadā*) *dāhitr ī* 'daughter of the draughter' (from *dahitr*) *pūttr ī* 'son's daughter' (from *putra* "son") correspond (irrespective of the vowel augment) with regard to accent, also Greek words like *Ταῖταλ ἰδ* *Πριαμ ἰδ* *Ἰαχ ἰδ* *Ἀηρείο* *Ἰον* *Ἀηρηιο* the *ἰδ* of which is only an inorganic prolongation of the base (see p. 139 and § 119) *Ἀηρείδ*, *Ἰον* *Ἀηρῖδ* from *Ἀηρεῖδ*, *Ἀηρηῖδ*, from the base *Ἀηρεν* corresponds to the Sanskrit forms like *mānā* : woman from *māntrā* man as descendant of Manu only that in Greek the Gunā or Vriddhi vowel exists already in the primary word. With respect to the relation of accent *e g* of *Ταῖταλἰδ* to the primitive base *Ταῖταλο*, compare that of *Ἰασηλῖθ a* 'Iasish thude' to *Ἰασηλῖθ a*. To class (2) the Latin *oi u m* as derivative from bird (*avis*) and the Greek *ω(F) oi* have already been referred. To names of fruits, like *δασυλῖθ a m* correspond Latin words like *pom u m* from *ponu s* *pir u m* from *piru s* *grun u m* from *grunu s* *ceru u m* from *cera su s*, and Greek words like *μῶλ oi* from *μηλι(ο) καρι oi* from *καρια ἄρι oi* from *ἄριο s*. As the Greek and Latin just like the Sanskrit reject the final vowels of primitive bases before the vowels of derivative suffixes (see § 913.) the possibility of the proposition cannot be contravened that the names of fruits in both languages may have been formed from the names of the trees not only by a change of gender but by the addition of a suffix that therefore *e g* the formal relation of *pirum* to *pirus* of *ἄριον* to *ἄριος* may be a different one from that of *e g* [*C* Ed p. 1718] *bonum* to *bonus* *αγαθον* to *αγαθος* *. We should especially notice in this respect the relation of *μῶλον* to the base *μηλιδ*

* Though the names of trees in the said languages are feminine yet those in *us* and *s* are according to their form masculine (cf p. 1341 C ed.)

the δ of which is only an inorganic affix, which has been added to the originally long ι of $\mu\eta\lambda\acute{\iota}$ (see § 119), so that the Greek word, put into Sanscrit form, would be nothing else but *māli*, whence, as from the name of a tree, we should have to expect, with the suffix under discussion, the name of the fruit, *māl'-ā-m*. But if in Greek and Latin we derive the names of trees from the names of fruits, after the same fashion as those of the inhabitants of countries, as above (§. 902) we have endeavoured to represent the names of countries as the feminines of the names of the inhabitants, then, irrespective of accent, we might as easily arrive from a formally masculine neuter base $\mu\eta\lambda\omicron$ to a feminine base $\mu\eta\lambda\acute{\iota}\delta$ (for $\mu\eta\lambda\acute{\iota}$), as in Sanscrit, *e g.*, from *āyas-ā*, "the iron" (masc and neut) (nom., *āyasā-s*, *āyasā-m*), to *āyasī*. To class (5) correspond Latin adjectives which have been formed from substantive bases in $\acute{o}r$ (originally $\acute{o}s$, Sanscrit, *as*), by the suffix *u* (from *a*), *e g.*, *decōr-u-s*, *sopōi-u-s*, *honōi-u-s*, *sopōi-u-s*.

922 That in Zend, too, analogous forms to the classes of Sanscrit words discussed above (§ 915) are not wanting, is proved by bases like 𐬵𐬀𐬶𐬀𐬶𐬀 *csay-a*, "king," as "ruling" (𐬵𐬀𐬶𐬀 *csi*, "to rule"), 𐬀𐬶𐬀𐬶 *gar-a*, "throat," as "swallowing," 𐬀𐬶𐬀𐬶 *-gar-a*, "swallower," 𐬀𐬶𐬀𐬶𐬀 *-yāz-a*, "worshipper," 𐬀𐬶𐬀 *-ghn-a*, "slayer," 𐬀𐬶𐬀𐬶𐬀 *-yaōdh-a*, "combatant," at the end of compounds. Especial notice should be given

[G Ed p 1349] to the compound *drujēm-vanō* (theme *-vana*), "Druj-slaying," as analogous to Sanscrit compounds like *arin-damā-s*, "foe-taming" (§. 916). I at least am of opinion that we cannot venture to assume that in Zend, in departure from Sanscrit, the adjectives which are formed with the suffix *a* govern also, in their simple state, an accusative, and that, therefore, *drujēm* and *vanō*, which in the manuscripts are not, in writing, joined together, can be regarded as two independent words, as in the manuscripts of the Zend-Avesta the different portions

of a compound very often appear written separately * An example of a Zend word formed with the secondary suffix *a* is to be found in *ayanza* *ayanha*, iron an iron vessel" (= Sanscrit *āyasa*) from *ayas* iron (see Burnouf l c p 196)

923 The feminine of the suffix *a* viz *ā* forms in Sanscrit, oxytone abstracts like *bludd* cleaving *chudd* id *lshupā* the casting *blukshā* the begging *lshudhā* hunger *mudd* joy † So in Greek amongst other words *φορα φθορα κουρα φαγη τομη φυγη* In Latin beside *fuga* it is probable that *cura* the base word of *cūrāre* belongs to this class, which it seems to me has sprung from the Sanscrit root *kar kri* to make (*karōmi* "I make" *kurmus* we make" see § 490) The Gothic furnishes for this class of words the feminine bases *vrakō* persecution (opposed to *iraka* nom *vraks* perse [G Ld p 1300] cutor") *bidd* request *bolō* use ‡ *dailō* sympathy §, *tharbō* want *id-reigō* repentance || *saurgō* care *vulvō* plunder (root *valv* *vilita* *valv* *vulcrum*)

Burnouf (Études p 200) is of a different opinion as regards the case before us, who however regards and undoubtedly with justness, as a compound the expression *batsho-taburiao* which immediately precedes the members of which are, in the original manuscript, similarly separated and translates it by *trionphant de la haine*

† Remnants of this class of words which, however are not placed here by the Indian Grammarians are the before-discussed (§ 629) accusatives of the periphrastic preterite and the Zend infinitives in *ann* *Mriyayu* hunting is an isolated word from a theme of the 10th class with a perfect declension

‡ Root *bat* (presupposes a strong verb *bata* *lot*) whence *bats* good English 'better' In Sanscrit the root *blānd* to be fortunate corresponds whence *bhādra* fortunate admirable see Glossarium Sanscrit 1847 p 243

§ Root *dil* (= Sanscrit *dal* *findi*) presupposes a strong verb *deila* *dail* *dilum* see Glossary 1847 I 164

|| From a lost root which perhaps signified originally to blush then to be ashamed and appears to be connected with the Sanscrit root *ray*, whence *rakta* red

yukó, "strife," *h'vótó* "threatening," nom. *viaka*, *bida*, &c, § 137) The following exhibit inorganic *n* *reirón*, "the trembling," *biólh'a-lubón*, "brotherly love," *trigón*, "mourning" (see Grimm, II. p 53, n 555), nom *reiró*, &c (§ 142.). The following are Lithuanian examples of this class of words *maldà*, "request" (*meldžu*, "I request"), *deyà*, "wailing" (whence *dejoju*, "I lament, wail"), *ramsà*, "stopping" (*riemsu*, "I stop"), *raudà*, "complaint" (Sanskrit root *rud*, "to weep"), *gėda*, "shame" (whence *gėdinu*, "I shame"), *pa-galba*, "help" (*gelb-mi*, *pa-gelb-mi*, "I help"), *piė-spauda*, "oppression" *spaudžu*, "I press"), *pa-baiga*, "accomplishment" (*baigu*, "I accomplish") The following are examples in Old Slavonic (in Dobrowsky, p 276) *мѣвѣмѣа*, "*tumultus*" (*mlv-i-ti*, *молвѣти* *molv-i-ti*, "*tumultuari*"), *сѣвѣа* *slava*, "glory," *губѣа* *gǫb'a*, "*perditio*" (*gǫb-i-ti*, "*perdere*") *мѣвѣа* *myena*, "*mulatio*," *побѣда* *po-byeda*, "*victoria*," *оутѣха* *ǫt-tyecha*, "*consolatio*"

924 The suffix *z* is either identical with the demonstrative base *z* (see § 360), or, as I now prefer to assume, a weakening of the suffix *a*, which made its appearance in a period before the separation of our stem of languages, in the same way as, in Latin, the bases in *u* of the 2d declension (=Sanskrit *a*), as also those in *a* (=अ *á*), have fre-

[G Ed p 1351] quently permitted this vowel at the end of compounds to be corrupted to *z*, *e g*, in *imbellis*, *imberbis*, *multiformis* This suffix forms in Sanskrit, (1) feminine abstracts accenting the root, especially in the Vēda dialect, *e g*, *śānti-z-s*, "quickness," *kṛśhi-z-s*, "the ploughing," *tvīsh-z-s*, "lustre," *sāch-z-s*, "friendship," properly, "the following" (root *sach*, "to follow," cf Latin *sequor* and *socius* with *sachva-s*, "friend"), *lip-z-s*, "writing," *वृद्धि-z-s* *vṛṛdh-z-s*, "increase, fortune", *वृद्धि*

* Dative *vṛṛdhyé*, gen pl *vṛṛdhanām*, see Burnouf, "Etudes," pp 316, 324

dāh : s creation * *ᠳᠠᠬᠤ* *raj* : s "institutio" † The Gothic supplies for this class of words the feminine base *vanni* the suffering (root *ṽann* *vinna* *ṽann* *ṽunnum*) and from lost roots the bases *vrohi* accusation and *veni* hope nom *vunn* : s *vroh* : s *ven* : s In Old Slavonic to this class belong *рече* *ryechy* speech- cf in *syechy* the smiting flogging (theme *ryechu* *syechu* : *ch* euphonic for *k*), *ѣдо* *yady* food properly eating (theme *yadi*) in Greek *μῆν* : s (cf with respect to the root the Sanscrit *man yá* : s, wrath dislike), *δῆρ* : s (cf the Sanscrit root *dar* *dri* to tear asunder, *δερω* whence *vi dar-ana-m* 'war') *ἄγρο* : s and with *δ* added (cf § 125 p 138) the bases *ελπιδ*, *ὄπιδ* with *τ* added *χαριτ* For the latter we should have to expect in Sanscrit *hrish* : (from *harsh* :) nom *hrish* : s In Latin to this class belong perhaps the bases *cæd* : *labi* and *ambu g* : but in these and similar words the nominative singular in *e* : s causes a diffi [G Ed p 1352] culty as it would furnish occasion for a comparison with Sanscrit bases in *as* nominative masculine and feminine *as* e g *nubes* reminds us of the Sanscrit *nabhas* both as masculine meaning among other things cloud nom *nabhas* and as neuter on which the Greek neuter base *ισφες* (see § 129) and the Slavonic *nebes* (nom *nebo* § 264) heaven are based ‡ *Sedē* : s answers to the Sanscrit

* Root *dah*=Sanskrit *das* to give see Barnouf, *Yagna* Notes p ix Rem 16 whence it is clear that above (§ 180 p 197) for *ᠳᠠᠬᠤ* *daonhaot* we ought to read according to three other MSS *ᠳᠠᠬᠤ* *daonh* : t which *dāhi* according to §§ 180 and 56 must form in the ablative The accusative *ahim* of the same base is confirmed by the authority of V S p 83

† See § 180 I now regard the ablative *ᠳᠠᠬᠤ* *rajot* which is ambiguous as regards its gender as feminine

‡ In Lithuanian *debes* : s f (from *nebes* : s cf § 317) 'cloud' regarding which it may remain undecided whether, according to its origin it belongs to *nābhas* m or to *nabhas* n

सदस् *sádas*, "assembly" (perhaps originally "sitting"), and Greek *ἕδος*, *ἕδος(σ)-ος*. Consequently the *i* of *cadi*, *labi*, *nubi*, *sedī*, &c, which lies at the base of the oblique cases as theme, might have been deprived of a following *s*, or *r* for *s* (see § 22), and so the whole have migrated into the *i*-declension; where I recall attention to the exactly similar abbreviation which *munus*, *muner-is* (from *munis-is*), has experienced in the compounds *immun-s*, and *opus*, *operis*, from *opis-is* (= Sanscrit *āpas*, *āpas-as*), in *opi-fex* for *openi-fex*.

(2) Nouns of agency, and appellatives which, according to their primary meaning, are nouns of agency, or denote instruments. They are for the most part masculine, and accent, some of them the root, some the suffix. The following are examples: *chhīd-i-s*, "cleaver," *yáy-i-s*, "sacrificer," *pách-i-s*, "fire," as "cooking," *áh-i-s*, "snake," as "moving itself" (root *anl*); *pésh-i-s*, "thunderbolt," as "crushing," *vas-í-s*, "garment," *dhvan-í-s*, "sound," *kav-í-s*, "poet," as "speaking" (root *ku*, "to sound"), *chhīd-í-s*, f. "axe," as "cleaving;" *ruch-í-s*, f. "beam of light." Also some adjective bases, as *súch-i*, "pure," *bódh-i*, "knowing, wise," *tuv-í*, "much"², and, with reduplication, *jágm-i*,

[G Ed p 1353] "quick" (root *gam*, "to go," Vêd), *gághn-i*, "slaying" (root *han*, Vêd), with the accusative (S. V Benfey, p 74), *sásn-i*, "giving," with the accusative (Vêd l c), *sásah-í*, "enduring" (Vêd), with the accusative (l c p. 127). To the paroxytone nouns of agency, as *yáy-i-s*, "sacrificer," corresponds, in Greek, *τρόχ-i-s*, "runner" with *áh-is*, "snake," in Zend *𐬀𐬀𐬎𐬎 az-i-s*, the etymologically obscure *ēχ-i-s* is identical, and so, too, the Latin *angu-i-s*, the *u* of which (=v) is only a favourite affix after gutturals. To the oxytone feminine formations like *chhīd-í-s*,

² In the Vêda dialect, root *tu*, "to grow." From the same root comes the Old Prussian *toú-la-n*, "much" (neut), and the adverb *touls*, "more" (properly a comparative with *s*=Sanskrit *īyas*, *yas*, cf § 301)

axe as cleaving belong probably Greek feminine bases like *ραφ-ιδ* needle as 'sewing, *γραφ-ιδ* "style as writing *κοπ-ιδ* 'hanger sword as 'smiting *σφαγ-ιδ* butcher's knife as slaughtering and with passive signification *λεπ-ιδ* with both active and passive, *λαβ-ιδ* In Sanscrit the masculine as *ι s* (cf *ensis*) sword as being whirled (root *as* to cast) has a passive meaning The Greek termination *ιδ* the *δ* of which is undoubtedly an inorganic affix is however in so far ambiguous that its *ι* is frequently the abbreviation of *ι* Sanscrit *ι* and as the Sanscrit suffix *a* = Greek *ο* (see § 915) frequently forms its feminine by *ι* and *e g* parallel with the masculine *nadās* stands a feminine *nadi* likewise river as making *ι* rushing noise so we might also regard the said Greek formations in *ιδ* as corresponding to the Sanscrit formations in *ι* and therefore derive *e g* *γραφιδ* from *a* to be-presupposed masculine base *γραφο* or *ιραφο* in the same way as *e g* *στρατηγιδ* 'female leader of an army comes from *στρατηγο κορωνιδ* from *κορωιο* Beside the Sanscrit adjective bases like *suchi* *ι* pure *bodhi* *ι* 'knowing the Greek *τροφι* places itself as analogous In Gothic to this group of words belong the masculine substantive bases *yugga laudi* young man youth (root *lud* 'to grow = Sanscrit *ruh* from *iudhi*) nominative *lauth s*, *nai* *ι* 'slayer,' * [G Ed p 134] nominative *nau-s muni*, 'thought *saggi*, song (with euphonic *v* see § 388) and the feminine bases *dairi* 'portion (Sanskrit root *dal*, to cleave) *qiēni* 'woman as "bearing (Sanskrit root *jan* 'to bear) The Lithuanian remnants of this class of words are all feminine and their origin lies beyond the consciousness of the Lithuanian linguistic intelligence To this class belong as ancient transmis-

* From *naihi* *ι* with euphonic *ι* (see § 388) It with the Latin *ne* Greek *νε νε ρ* belongs to the Sanscrit root *nas* from *nak* to be ruined "

925 The suffix *u*, in which I think I recognise a demonstrative base, whence come the prepositions *ut*, *úpa*, and *upánu*, forms, in Sanscrit, (1) adjectives from desiderative themes with the signification of the participle present. They, like the latter, govern the accusative, and retain also

[G Ed p 1355] their energy by the accentuation of the first syllable, *i e* in the case before us, of the syllable of reduplication, *e g.* *dídrikshuh pitús áu* "wishing to see the parents" (Sâv 5 109) (2) Adjectives which, in agreement with the Greek in *υ*, and Lithuanian in *u*, for the most part accent the suffix, *e g.* *tanú*, "thin" (properly, "stretched out," root *tan*, "to stretch out"), Greek *τανυ-*, "stretched," "long," *svádú*, "sweet" ("savoury," root *svad*, "to taste well"), Greek *ῥδύ*, Lithuanian *saldù*, from *sladù* for *svadù* (see § 20), *laghú*, "light" ("moveable," root *langh*, "to spring

* See Burnouf, "Yajna," p 444

over) Greek $\epsilon\lambda\alpha\chi\upsilon$ *mridu* soft tender (properly fine pounded from *mardu* root *mard mrid* to crush) Greek $\beta\rho\alpha\delta\upsilon$ from $\mu\rho\alpha\delta\upsilon$ *dsu* from *dku* quick * (root *a* to attain originally perhaps to be quick to run "hence *dsia* steed" is runner) Greek $\omega\kappa\upsilon$ *puru* from *paru* much (root *par* φ *prī* to fill *pararmi* 'I fill) Greek $\tau\omicron\lambda\upsilon$ from $\pi\alpha\lambda\upsilon$ for $\tau\alpha\rho\upsilon$ Gothic *filu* indeclinable *prī'm* broad "from *prathu* (comparative *prathuyas* root *prath* *extendi expandi*)) Greek $\lambda\alpha\tau\upsilon$ Lithuanian *platu*, *guru* heavy † Greek $\beta\alpha\rho\upsilon$ (as $\beta\iota\beta\eta\mu\iota$ compared with *yagdmi*) *uru* great (probably from *iaru* from *iar* *eri* to cover) Greek $\kappa\upsilon\rho\upsilon$ *bahu* much probably from *badhu*, ‡ Greek $\beta\alpha\theta\upsilon$ deep " To the Greek $\theta\alpha\rho\sigma\upsilon$ $\theta\rho\alpha\sigma\upsilon$ corresponds the Lithuanian *drasu* bold courageous § In Gothic besides the already mentioned indeclinable *filu* there belong to this class || *thaursu* nom m f *thaursu* s neuter *thaursu* (root *thars* = Sanscrit *tarsā* [G Ld p 1300] *trish* dry and *qiairru* soft quiet mild (our *kirr*) The following are examples in 7nd $\gamma\gamma\gamma$ *pōuru* much = Sanscrit *puru* $\gamma\gamma\gamma$ *erazu* direct = $\varphi\varphi$ *ryu* (root *ry*

* In classical Sanscrit only an adverb in the Veda dialect also an adjective

† From *garu* whence compare *gīryas* superlative *garishtha* see p 1058 p 1091, G ed) I do not know a root suitable to this adjective as regards its signification

‡ Root *banh* to grow from *bandh* as *trah* to grow from *tradh* see § 23

§ Sanscrit root *dīarā* to dare to which also belongs our *dreist* Regarding other cognate affinities see Glossarium Sanscr, o 1847 p 186

|| That *qiairru* s is radically identical with *qiair nu* s millstone may appear strange I therefore recall notice to the connection of the above mentioned Sanscrit *mridu* 'tender' with the root *mard mri* to crush The root of the Gothic *qiairru* s (with inorganic doubling of the liquid) and *qiair nu* s is to be found in the Sanscrit *jar* φ *ji* to triturate to be ground

from *arj* or *raj*), *ṛṣṣu* *āśu*, "quick," whence the superlative *ṛṣṣṣu* *āśista*; *vanhu*, "good," = Sanscrit *vasú* (see § 56³) The reason that, in Latin, adjectives corresponding to this class of words are wanting, is, as has been already elsewhere remarked, | that that language has added to all the words which, according to their origin, belong to this class, the inorganic affix of an *i*. In this way, from the Sanscrit *tanú* has been formed *tenui*, and *gurú*, for *garú*, has become *gravi* (transposed from *garui*), from *laghú* has come *levi* (for *legui*), from *śāḍú*, *suavi* (for *suadu*), from *mṛdú*, for *mandú*, *mollis*, as it seems by assimilation from *molvi* (cf § 312, pp 428, 429), where the *l* corresponds either to the Sanscrit *r* or *d*. (3) Appellatives, *e g*, *dāru*, n "wood," as "to be cleft," † *īshu*, m f "arrow," as "moving itself," *bāndhu*, m "kinsman," from *bandh*, "to bind," *rāṇu*, m "coid," as "bind- [G Ed p 1357] ing" (cf Latin "*ligare*"), *kārú*, m "artificer," as "making," *bhṛdú*, m "thunderbolt," as "cleaving," *tanú*, f. "body," as "stretched out," also in Zend (see § 180 p 197) So, in Greek, beside the already-mentioned *δόρυ*, perhaps also the bases *γῆρυ*, f (Sanskrit root *gar*, *ḡ gī*, whence *gir*, f. "voice"), *νέκυ* (Sanskrit root *naś*, from *nak*, "to be ruined" (= Zend *naśu*, "a corpse" (see § 247), *στάχυ*, "ear of corn," as "raised

* To the superlative *āśista*, which Neriensengh translates by *vīgavat-tama* (see Burnouf, "Valista," p 14, "Etudes," p 211), corresponds admirably the Greek *ᾤκιστος*. In Sanscrit we should have expected *āśishtha*

† "Influence of the Pronouns on the formation of Words," p 20

‡ Cf *δόρυ*, in the oblique cases *δόρατ*, as, *γόνατ*, together with *γόνυ*, *ῥύ*, n. The Gothic lengthens the two neuter bases by the affix *-m*, which is again removed from the nominative and accusative, accusative, hence, *triva*, "tree," *kniva*, "knee," nom acc *trui*, *kniva-m*, *triva-m*)

up * $\pi\eta\chi\upsilon$ = Sanscrit *bāhu* arm Zend 𐬨𐬀𐬭𐬀 *bāzu* (Sanskrit root *bāh* or *adh* to strive), in Latin *curru* *car* as running perhaps *acu* if it belongs to the Sanskrit root अकृ *ak* from *ak* in the signification to penetrate † whence also has come the Sanskrit *ar-ānu s* thunderbolt, as penetrating The Gothic furnishes us with several masculine bases for this class of words which except *lith u*, limb as moving itself (root *lith* to go) *mag u* boy (root *mag* originally to grow then to be able) come from lost roots viz *auru* messenger (Sanskrit root *ar ri* to go) *fol u* foot as going (Sanskrit *pad* to go whence *pad* and *pād a s* foot) *auhs u* ox (Sanskrit *uksh* to wet to sow whence *ukshan* bull) *grēd u* hunger ‡ In Lithuanian *dangu s* [G Ed p 1308] heaven as covering (*dengiu* I cover) probably belongs to this class

926 The Sanscrit suffix *an* in the strong cases *du* forms appellatives which denote the person acting and like the

* In so far as it is connected with $\sigma\tau\epsilon\chi\omega$ (root $\sigma\tau\chi$ = Sanscrit *stigh*, 'to mount') the *a* is only the Guna vowel like the *o* of $\sigma\tau\acute{o}\chi\omicron\varsigma$

† In this case *acu* is a denominative from *acu* as in Greek $\epsilon\gamma\gamma\eta\rho$ ω from $\gamma\eta\rho$ (see § ~ 7) Against a former conjecture which I agreed with Pott in encouraging that *acu* and similar words in the European sister languages, belong to the Sanskrit root *śú* (from *ho*) to sharpen with the preposition *ā* speaks the circumstance that in Sanscrit itself this preposition does not occur in combination with *śo* and that in the Greek forms which are most probably connected with the Latin *acu* viz $\alpha\kappa\eta$ $\alpha\omega\eta$ $\mu\eta$ $\alpha\rho\epsilon$ &c as also the Lithuanian *asz tru s* peaked sharp *asz mu* sharpness and the Slavonic остръ *os tr* sharp in all of these the initial vowel belongs to the root As अकृ *ak* is a compound of *ak* the Sanskrit *ig ra m* peak may also be assigned to this root and an anomalous mutation of the tenuis to the medial be assumed

‡ The gender is uncertain *jrēdo* I hunger is a denominative The Sanscrit supplies the root *pridh* from *grad* 'to wish to require' whence also the Slavonic *glad* hunger

majority of the analogous Greek formations in *αν*, *εν*, *ον*, *ην*, *ων*, accent the radical syllable. The following are examples *snéhan*, "friend," as "loving," *rájan*, "king," as "ruling," *tákshan*, "carpenter," as "cleaving, forming," *úkshan*, "bull," as "impregnating," *viśhan*, an appellation of India, originally, "causing to rain," also "bull," as "impregnating with seed." To the latter, from the root *varsh*, *viśh*, ("to rain, to rain over, to besprinkle, to sow"), whence, also, other names of male animals, corresponds, in root, suffix, and accentuation, the Greek base *ἄρσεν* (from *Ἄρσεν*), by assimilation, *ἄρρεν*, from an obsolete root. The suffix under discussion further exhibits itself in Greek in the same form in the base *κῆρ-εν*, "youth," as "speaking." This suffix, however, diverges from its original destination in the adjective base *τέρ-εν*, in which *εν* has a passive signification, like the *ον* of *πέπ-ον*, "ripe," properly, "cooked," which is originally identical with it. The suffix *ον* appears, in its original destination in *τέκτ-ον*, contrasted with the above-mentioned *πᾶσι* *táksh-an*, "a carpenter," and with demitted accent in *σταγ-όν*, ("drop," as "trickling"), *τρυγ-όν*, *ἀρηγ-όν*, *ἀη-δόν*, *εἰκ-όν*. The original *α*, with the genuine accentuation, has remained in *τάλαν*. As regards the bases in *ην* and *ων*,

[G Ed. p 1359] it is to be observed that the Sanscrit suffix *an* forms the strong cases in *án* (see § 129), with the exception of the vocative singular, and this latter is probably the older form of the suffix, which appears to me to have arisen from *ana*, so that the dropping of the final *a* has been compensated by lengthening the first. The shortening of the vowel of the suffix under discussion, and its entire suppression in the Sanscrit weakest cases (see § 130), have, however, probably entered into the different languages independently of one another, and probably for the first time after the separation of languages. Compare, e g, the plural nominatives *σκήπων-ες*, ("staves," as "supporting"), *κλύδων-ες*, ("billows," as "laving"), *αἰθων-ες*, *εἶρων-ες*, *τρίβων-ες*,

(the latter contrary to the Sanscrit principle with a passive signification) with the plural nominatives of the above mentioned (p 1358 G ed) Sanscrit bases *snehan as* *rājan as* *tukshan as* *vrishān as** In genitives like *snēhn am* *amicorum* sing *snehn as* as generally in the worst cases the Sanscrit stands in very disadvantageous comparison with Greek forms like *σκηπῶν ων*, *σκηπῶν-ος* while on the other hand it surpasses the Greek in this that in the classical language it has nowhere allowed the length of the vowel of the suffix to be lost in the strong cases (with the exception of the vocative singular and the anomalous *pūshan* the sun is nourisher in all the strong cases) and hence e.g. it contrasts the forms *tukshan am* *tukshan ān* *talshan as* with the Greek *τεκτοῖ α* *τεκτον ε* *τειτον ες*† Moreover the Sanscrit in this class of words has never suffered the accent to sink [G Ed p 1360] down on the suffix like, e.g. in the Greek *πενθην απατει*

927 The Latin exhibits the suffix under discussion in the form *on* and therefore likewise favours the supposition that its vowel was originally pervadingly long To this class belong e.g. the bases *ed on* *ger on* *combib on* *prædic on* *err on* the accusatives of which *ed on* *em ger on* *em* &c. corre-

* *n* for *n* in the two last forms, through the enphonic influence of the preceding *sh*

† With regard to the *τ* for Sanscrit *sh* *τ κτω* has the same relation to the Sanscrit *tuksha* (see § 19) that *ρ* *ς* has to *riksha s* bear (from *arī* *la s*) the sibilant of which is preserved by the Latin *ursu s* as original In the Veda dialect the suffix under discussion admits after *sh* in the strong cases at option either *ā* or *a* (Pan VI 4 J) e.g. *tal han am* and *tal shan am* = *τ κτ ν α* *tāl shān-as* and *tukshan as* = *τ κτο* *s* I cannot however regard this agreement with the Greek with respect to the shortening of the vowel as merely accidental as in the Veda dialect it is bound up with the condition of *sh* preceding which shews it elf also in the above mentioned *pūshan* and as the Veda dialect admits also of several other forms which can only have arisen in the progress of corruption

spond well to the Sanscrit, like *snéh-ân-am*, *râg ân-am*. A weakening of the original *â* to *ι* is found in *pect-in*, nominative, *pect-en* (according to §. 6), the *ι* of which for *ô* resembles that of the base *ho-min*, the nominative of which belongs to a base *ho-môn* (see § 797 p 1077) In Gothic the suffix spoken of has throughout in the singular, in the cases which, in Sanscrit, are weak, just like the suffix *man* (§ 799), experienced the weakening of the *a*-sound to *ι* (see § 132) To this class belong the bases (some of which have sprung from lost roots) *han-an*, "cock," as "singing" (Latin *cano*, Sanscrit *śans* from *kans*, "to say"), *stau-an*, "judge" (Sanskrit root *stu*, "to praise"), *fawra-gagg-an*, "superintendent" (literally, "preceder"), *ar-an*, "eagle," as "flying" (Sanskrit root *ar*, *ι*, "to go"), *ah-an*, "sense, understanding" (cf *ah-man*, "spirit," § 799, *ah-ya*, "I think, I mean"), *hut-an*, "hypocrite," *nut-an*, "catcher," *gasinth-an*, "companion," *skul-an*, "debtor" (root *skal*, "to owe, to be obliged"), *veh-an*, "priest," as "consecrating,"

[G Ed p 1361] *spill-an*, "announcer," *auhsan*, "ox," = Sanscrit *ūkshan* (see § 82), nom *auhsa* = *ūkshâ* (see § 140) In Old High German the Gothic *a* of this suffix and of the suffix *man* has been corrupted to *o* or *u* in the genitive and dative plural, however, we find inorganic *ô*, while the Gothic *an-ê*, *a'-m* (for *an-m*), would lead us to expect a short *o* (see Grimm, I p 624) The *ι* of the Gothic genitive and dative singular has remained, or been further corrupted to *e*, which latter, in the Middle and New High German, has extended itself through all the cases The Old High German bases in *on*, *e g*, *bot-on*, "messenger," as "announcing" † *ox-on*, "ox," *has-on*, "hare," as

* *Spillô*, "I announce, I relate" The *s* is probably a phonetic prefix or an obsolete preposition Compare the Old Prussian *bilu*, "I say," Lithuanian *biłoyu* id, Irish *bri*, "word," and the Sanscrit root *brû*, "to speak"

† Properly, "offering" The root *but*, "to offer," is based on the Sanscrit

springing (Sanskrit *śas* to spring *śasā* hare)
hluf on runner *trinf* on drinker *fah* on seizer
heri *loh* on leader of an army correspond excellently to
 Greek bases like *απηγ* *ov* and the nominatives which drop the
u like *bot* *o* (our *Bote* messenger from the base *Boten*)
 to the Latin like *edo combibo* The English language ex-
 hibits a remarkable remnant of the Sanskrit suffix *an* in
 the plural *oxen* which according to form is nothing but
 the form of the Sanskrit base *akshan* a little altered which
 appears in German in the form *Ochsen* not only in the
 plural but also in all the oblique cases of the singular
 Through its limitation to the plural the ancient formative
 suffix has in English obtained the appearance of an expres-
 sion of plurality and just so in *brethren* (Sanskrit base
bhratar bhrātri) *children* where the ori-
 ginal state of our stem of languages gives no occasion for
 it In modern Netherlandish this suffix has fixed itself in
 the plural of all regular words and has [G Ed p 136]
 hence become a distinct mark of plurality for the practi-
 cal use of language Regarding a similar abuse of ano-
 ther Sanskrit suffix in the oldest period of High German
 (see § 241)

928 The suffix under discussion does not form in San-
 skrit regular neuter bases but some anomalous neuters in
 form their weakest cases (see § 130) from bases in *an* e g
aksh eye (as seeing) from *akshan* which may per-
 haps have originally had a perfect declension and on which
 perhaps *áksha* which at the end of compounds takes the
 place of *aksh* is based with the loss of an *n* as also *raj an*
 which is the word most in use of this class is regularly
 replaced as the final element of a compound by *rāja* Con-

sanskrit *budh* to know and has assumed a causal signification so that
boten as making to know approaches nearer to the old meaning than
 the verb *butu* *offero*

versely, in German, several bases of words, which, in their simple state, terminate in a vowel, assume, at the end of compounds, the suffix *an*, e g, in Gothic, *ga-darlan*, "sympathiser" (from *ga*, "with," and *darh*, nom, *darks*, f. "part"), *ga-hlaiban*, "companion" (*hlaiba*, nom, *hlaifs*, m, "bread"), *us-lithan*, "palsied" (*us*, "from," and *lithu*, n, *lithu-s*, m, "member") In Old High German the appellation of "day" (simple theme *taga*, nom *tag*) has, in several compounds, by extending itself to *tagon*, re-approached its conjectural Sanscrit sister word *áhan*,* Zend (𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 *aśan*), (see § 253 p 270) To return to the Sanscrit neuter base *akshán*, "eye," whence, in the Vêda dialect also, the middle

[G Ed p 1363] cases spring at least the instrumental plural *akshábhīḥ* the Gothic base *augan*† corresponds to it in root, suffix, and gender As the nominative, accusative, and vocative plural of neuters in Sanscrit belong to the strong cases, we should here expect from *akshán* the form *aksháni*, from *akshán-a* (see § 234), and to this the Gothic *augón-a*, "eyes," admirably corresponds (see § 801 p 1083, Note) In Gothic, however, the nominative, accusative, and vocative singular of neuter bases in *an* also prove themselves to be strong, hence, *augô* for the *akshá* 'to be expected in San-

* I regard *áhan* as an abbreviation of *dáhan* (root *dah*, "to burn," here, "to give light"), see Gloss Scr, a 1847, p 26, where, however, as in my Sanscrit Grammar, this anomalous word, which forms the middle cases in *áhas*, is erroneously given as masculine It is neuter, and therefore forms in the nominative, accusative, and vocative plural *aháni* (the Vêda form *áhá* belongs to the base *áha*), dual *áhní*, or Vêdic *áhaní*, see Benf Gloss

† The sibilant of the Sanscrit root may be a later affix, and is wanting in the Gothic, as in the Latin *oculus*, the Lithuanian *akī-s*, and Greek root *ὀπ*, from *ὀκ* For the *g* in *augan* we might expect *h*, according to § 87, and therefore *auhan*, which form probably preceded *augan* In that case we should regard the *u* as the weakening of the old *a*, and explain the *a* of the diphthong *au* according to § 82 With the Sanscrit *aksha* at the end of compounds the Gothic base *iha* or *aiha*, of *haiha*, "one-eyed," has been already compared (see § 308 p 418)

serit With the Gothic neuter base *lat in* 'water' (for which in Lithuanian where in substantives the neuter is in general wanting we find the masculine base *wanden* (nom *uandu* see § 139 p 151) the Sanscrit compares the base *udan* which however can only be inferred from its derivatives *udan iat* ocean (literally, 'gifted with water') and *udan yu* thirst (i.e. craving for water) and whose gender therefore cannot be decided. Perhaps *udan* is also contained in the compounds which begin with *uda* 'water' as final *n* is regularly suppressed in such a position a simple *uda* however has hitherto not been discovered. The corresponding verbal root is *und* (to be wet) the nasal of which has remained in the Latin *unda* and Lithuanian *uandu*. In Lithuanian we must further in respect of its suffix refer to this class the base *rud en* nom *rudū* autumn and radically perhaps to the Sanscrit *ruh* [G Id p 1364] from *rudh* to grow to which also *inter alia* belongs the Slavonic *rod i ti* to bear young.

929 I look upon the Sanscrit recented suffix *in* as a weakening of the suffix *an*. After augmenting the radical vowel it forms words like *śādin* speaking (root *śad*) *kārin* making (root *kar kṛi*) *harin* taking rubbing *śhin* wishing *yodhin* striving (root *yudh*) *śālin* squeezing out which occur only at the end of compounds e.g. *rita vadin*, speaking truth Yajur V 7 *manyu savin* zealously squeezing out (the Soma) S V I 3 1 4 1) We find in the simple form as substantive *वामिन्* *kāmin* loving lover. With respect to the weakening of the *a* to *i* these formations correspond to the above mentioned (§ 927) Latin bases *pect in* and the Gothic genitives and derivatives like *stau in s* *judicis* *stau in* *judici* in contrast to the more organic *a* of the other cases e.g. of the accusative *stau an* *judicem* and of the nominative and accusative plural *stau an s* *judicēs*. The Sanscrit itself presents some remarkable words in which the suffixes *an* and *in* occur to

gether, and indeed so, that *an*, or rather *ān* (see § 926), occurs only in the strong cases, and *n* extends over all those weak cases which do not, as is done in the said words by the weakest cases, entirely divest themselves of the suffix, and, beyond these, also to the vocative, which especially inclines to a weakening of the vowel. Moreover, the accent in the words spoken of is so divided, that the cases with the suffix *an* (*ān*) follow the accentuation of *rájan*, “king, ruler,” and similar words, and those with the suffix *n* (excepting the vocative, § 785 Rem. p 1051), that of *-láín*, “making,” *-vādín*, “speaking,” and similar formations in *n*. Thus, *e g*, from the root *manth*, “to shake,” comes the base *manthan*, “a churn,” as “shaker”

[G Ed p. 1365] (accented like *rájan*), and hence, by weakening the root, the suffix, and the accentuation, the base *mathín*, which is found also at the beginning of compounds, and is therefore viewed by the grammarians as the proper theme. The analogy of *mánthan*, *mathín*, is, moreover, followed by the already-mentioned *pánthan*, *pathín*, “way,” where the suffix under discussion has a passive signification, a circumstance which has already been remarked of the Greek *τριβών*, which is, in formation, akin to it. The root is *path*, “to go,” perhaps originally *panth* · the signification, therefore, of *pánthan*, *pathín*, is tantamount to “gone upon, trodden.” In the Vêda dialect the accusative singular *pánthānam*, and the nominative plural *pánthānas*, allow the *n* to be cast out, after which the two *a*-sounds coalesce, whence *pánthām*, *pánthās*, a remarkable though fortuitous coincidence with the Greek *εἰκώ*, *εἰκοῦς*, *εἰκούς*, for *εἰκόνα*, *εἰκόνης*, *εἰκόνας*.

930 The suffix *n* is used in Sanscrit also for the formation of derivative words, and then denotes the person gifted with the thing which is expressed by the primitive, and has, therefore, a passive meaning like the primitive *pathín*, “way,” as “trodden.” This *n* has likewise the

accent *e g* *dhanin* rich endowed with riches (nom m *dhan* according to § 139) from *dhaná* wealth, *lén* covered with hair having beautiful hair (from *lesu* hair) and as substantive masculine a lion ("the maned") *hasén* and *kar n* the elephant properly having a trunk from *hasá* *kara* hand trunk. It appears to me to admit of no doubt that the secondary *n* too is a weakening of *an* or rather *án* which in Greek and Latin has remained in the form of *ω*, *ón* in possessives to which the use of language has imparted a partly amplified signification in like manner as several of the Sanscrit formations under discussion may be regarded as ampliatives since *e g* *lés in* as lion is the shaggy [G Ed p 1360] *dant in* (gifted with teeth) as elephant is the large toothed *dánshtr in* (from *danshrá* tooth) as boar is the tusk endowed. So in Greek *e g* the bases and at the same time nominatives *γιάθ ω* thick-cheeked (properly only having cheeks) *κεφαλ ων* thick head *γαστρ ω* thick belly having a great punch "Πλουτ ω properly having great riches, in Latin *e g* *nas ón** *capit ón* front *ón ped on bucc on labi-on gul on Cæs on* from a lost base is perhaps together with *cæsaries* connected with the Sanscrit *lesu* (nom *lésá s* hair) although the Sanscrit *s* (from *h*) would lead us to expect in Latin *c*. But if notwithstanding the connection which Pott (E I p 588) conjectures should be well founded we may recognise in the name *Cæs ón* a cognate formation of the above mentioned Sanscrit appellation of the lion (*lés in* from *lés án*) and of the proper name of a *दामयन्ति* which we meet with in *Kahidras s Úrvasi* while the feminine form of the said word (*les inr*) in the *Nalus* appears as the name of a female attendant of *Damayanti*. As regards the ac

* In Sanscrit we should have to expect from *n s* nose a *nás in* formed with *n*

centuation, the Greek possessives correspond to the Sanscrit nouns of agency in *an*, *ān* compare *e g*, the plural γάστρων-*cs* with *rājān-as* The feminine formation *ρύγχαινα* (for *ρύγχανια*) is remarkable it corresponds to *τάλαινα*, *μέλαινα* (see § 119.), and therefore presupposes a masculine neuter base *ρύγχαν*, and represents the Sanscrit feminine possessives like *kéśinī*, “having (fine or much) hair,” for *kéśānī* So, according to its form, *θερόπαινα* is based, not on *θεραποντ*, but on a to-be-presupposed base *θεραπαν* and

[G Ed p 1367] represents the Sanscrit feminines like *īśānī* (“she that rules,” “queen”) for *īśānī*, and this for *īśānī*

931 It is important to observe, that where the Greek possessive suffix *ων* refers not to persons but to rooms, which are gifted with the thing expressed by the base name, the accentuation which has been recognised above (§ 785 commencement of Remark) as the more energetic and animated is replaced by the weaker, since the accent sinks down from the first or second syllable of the word to the suffix, thus, *e g*, *ἵππων*, properly, “gifted with horses,” with the to-be-supplied secondary idea of room, and thus “stall for horses,” so *ἀνδρ-ών*, *γυναικ-ών*, *πιθ'-ών*, *οἶν'-ών*, *ἀμπελ'-ών*, *σιτ'-ών*, *μελισσ'-ών*, *περιστερ-ών*,⁷ in opposition to the living possessors of the things denoted, as *Γνάθων*, *Πλούτων*, *Χείλων*, *Κεφάλων*, *Τύχων*. The accented

— — — — —
 “ I regard the *ε* of *περιστερε-ών* as the thinning of the final vowel of the base of the primary word, which in *περιστερ'-ών*, according to the prevailing principle (see § 913), is suppressed So *ἀμπελε-ών* together with *ἀμπελ'-ών*, *οἶνε-ών* together with *οἶν'-ών*, *ῥοδε-ών* with *ῥοδ'-ών*; *χαλκε-ών*, *λυχνε-ών* There is no source for the *ε* of *κωνωπεών* in the primitive base *κωνωπ*, and it is probably introduced through analogy with the forms in which the *ε* is founded on the final vowel of the primitive base, and the origin of which is now lost sight of by the language With respect to the weakening of *ο* to *ε* compare vocatives like *λύκε* from *λύκο* (§ 204)

suffix $\omega\iota$ transferred from that which possesses room to time forms also names of months in which the preceding ι every where b longs to the primitive where this really admits of being traced hence *e g* $\epsilon\lambda\alpha\phi\eta\beta\omicron\lambda\iota\ \omega\iota$ properly gifted with the hunting feast and hence month of the hunting feast The Sanscrit forms with the feminine of the suffix *in* (=Greek $\omega\nu$) words which express the place provided with the thing denoted At least from all the appellatives of the lotus flower come words in *ini* [G Ed p 1568] which denote lotus field lotus pond as *e g* *padm ini* from *padma* Hereto remarkably correspond Greek feminines like $\rho\omicron\delta\ \omega\iota\alpha$ properly 'gifted with roses' hence rose garden where $\alpha\varsigma$ is in the above mentioned (§ 119) forms in $\tau\rho\iota\alpha$ =Sanskrit *tri* to the feminine character; there has been further added an inorganic α thus $\omega\iota\alpha$ =*ini* from *ani*

932 The suffix $\text{अन} \text{ ana}$ from *ana* and *ani* which we have already taken cognizance of as α means of formation of abstract substantives as *gam ana m* the going and on which the infinitives of various Indo European languages are based * I regard $\alpha\varsigma$ identical with the demonstrative *ana* (see § 372 *prissim*) This suffix forms in Sanscrit *inter alia* proparoxytone appellatives neuter or masculine as *nay ana m* eye $\alpha\varsigma$ gazing (root *ni* with Guna) *lōch ana m id* $\alpha\varsigma$ seeing (root *lōch*) *vad ana m* mouth $\alpha\varsigma$ speaking *lap ana m id* (root *lap* to speak cf Latin *loquor* and *labium*) *das ana m* and *das ana s* tooth

* See §§ 851 (p 1211 G ed) 852 876 877 To the feminine abstracts in $\text{अनि} \text{ ani}$ like *yach ani* the begging (§ 877) I have further to assign the Gothic base *ga maht-ānōn* (nom *anō*) the cutting in pieces as an analogous form which stands alone in Gothic which is distinguished from its Sanscrit prototypes (see § 142) only by the *n* which in German is so frequently added to bases terminating originally in a vowel

as "biting" (root *dan's* from *dank* = Greek *δακ*), *váh-ana-m*, "ear," as "carrying" , *táp-ana-s*, "sun," as "burning," *dáh-ana-s*, "fire," as "burning," *dárp-ana-s*, "mirror," as "making proud" (root *darp*, *drip* in the causal), *tár-ana-s*,

[G Ed p 1369] "boat," as "ferrying over." Hereto well correspond, with respect to accentuation also, Greek bases in *ανο*, and indeed to the neuter, such as *δρέπ-ανο-ν* ("sickle," as "cutting off"), *γλύφ-ανο-ν*, *κόπ-ανο-ν*, *ὄργ-ανο-ν*, *τήγ-ανο-ν* (for *τήκανον*), *ῥχ-ανον* (as "means of holding"), *σκέπ-ανο-ν* † The following are examples with a passive meaning

πλόκ-ανο-ν, *πόπ-ανο-ν*, *τύμπ-ανο-ν*. To the masculine forms like *dáh-ana-s*, "fire," as "burning," correspond *στέφ-ανο-ς*, *χό-ανο-ς*, *χόδ-ανο-ς*. In Lithuanian, to this class belong most probably words like *tek-úna-s*, "runner," where the first vowel of the suffix is weakened as regards quality, but lengthened as regards quantity, and has drawn to itself the accent

The following are other examples *bĕg-úna-s*, "fugitive," *klaid-úna-s*, "wanderer," *pa-klaid-úna-s*, "lover" (*klys-tu*, "I wander," pret *klyd-au*), *lep-úna-s*, "weakling," *mal-úna-s*, "mill," *ryj-úna-s* or *ryy-úna-s*, "devourer" (*ryj-ú*, "I swallow, I devour") In Gothic, perhaps the base *thrud-ana*, nom *thrudan's*, "king," if it originally signifies "ruling," belongs to this class ‡ In Old High German the masculine

* The following have a passive signification e g , *śáy-ana-m*, "couch, bed," and *ás-ana-m*, "seat". To the former corresponds the Zend *𐬀𐬎𐬌𐬎𐬎𐬎𐬎 śay-anē m* Another example in Zend is *𐬀𐬎𐬌𐬎𐬎𐬎𐬎 khar-anē m*, "sustenance," as "being eaten" (Burnouf, "Yaçna," p 550)

† As in Sanscrit the *ay* of causals and verbs of the 10th class, which has its influence in the formation of words, is dropped before the suffix *ana* (*dárp-ana-s*, not *darpayana-s*), so in Greek the *a* of the corresponding verbs in *áo* falls off hence *σκέπ-ανο-ν*, the *a* of which has nothing to do with that of *σκεπ-áo*

‡ The lost root *thud* is perhaps an extension of the Sanscrit *tu*, "to grow" (whence *táv-as*, "strength"), which we have already recognised in Gothic in the form in *tav* (see p 1342 G ed § 917, 3d Note)

base *uag* and wagon nom acc *uag an* irrespective of gender accords admirably with the above mentioned Sanscrit *uáh ana m*. The suffix under discussion forms in Sanscrit adjectives also with the accent on the final syllable of the suffix as *sobh aná* fair (*sobh ana s aná aná m*), properly shining (root *sabh* to shine) [C Ed p 130] *jal-aná* shining *chal aná* tottering trembling. So in Greek *σκηαιος*, 'covering', *ικαιος* sufficient.

933 Let us now examine somewhat closer the Sanscrit suffix *as* the dative of which we have already recognised as the termination of Vedic infinitives (see § 836) and whose origin we have sought in the root *as* of the verb substantive (see §§ 835 837). The Indian grammarians however recognise *as* infinitives *as* as representatives of the form in *tu* only those forms which have no other case from the same base accompanying them as is the case *e g* with *juas-t* in order to live the sole remnant of the base *juas*. On the other hand *chakshas-t* which above (at p 1221 G ed § 836) in a passage there quoted from the Rg Veda we have seen standing beside a dative of the common infinitive in a similar relation is looked upon by the Scholast Sivanra as no infinitive clearly because *chakshas*, the seeing is retained with a complete declension and for example has a nominative, which is wanting in the Vedas in the form in *tu* in the simple word †. The simple suffix called *asun*

* To this class of words I refer the Zend *ayawāyāw anā* living (cf Burnouf 'Yaçna, Notes pp 81 and 88 n) from the contracted root *zu* for *ju* (cf § 109b 2 p 110, and § 58).

† *Jiātū* *vita*, which occurs in the nominative I should agree with Benfey in regarding as an infinitive were it found in sentences like *na sahnōti jiātum* 'he cannot live' or like *juitāñ jiātum vitam vire*. In the passages, however quoted by Benfey (Glossary p 72) the signification *vita* is sufficient moreover *jiātū* is not like the infinitives in *tu* a feminine but a masculine and neuter (see Unadi I 76) and signifies, like the Latin word akin to it in root and formation *victus* be-

[G Ed p 1371] or *asī* by the Indian grammarians, with reference to the difference of accentuation forms

[G Ed p 1372] . A) Abstract neuters with the accent on

sides "living," also "nourishment, food, means of living (cooked rice, &c.)," and, moreover, "medicine," as "making to live" When, however, Benfey, in his recently-published "Complete Grammar of the Sanscrit Language," p 431, says that *jivātum* appears in the Vêdas distinctly as an infinitive, I am unable to perceive this distinctness, at least from the passages quoted in the Glossary to the S V, just as I am unable to deduce, with Benfey, the masculine nature of these infinitives from the Vêdic infinitive datives in *tavé*, as, indeed, as the said learned man himself says in § 727 V, which is adduced as proof, the feminines in *u* optionally form the dative in *avé*, while the masculines do so necessarily Now the Vêdic infinitive datives actually avail themselves of the option of using in the dative both the termination *é* with Guna, and also the termination *ā*, inasmuch as they employ both the one and the other form, with this peculiarity, that before the heavier and exclusively feminine termination *ā* they gunise the *u* of the suffix I will not here, in support of my views, refer to the gerund in *tvā*, as Benfey (l c, p 424) pronounces no opinion whatever on it as to its gender and case, and especially as to the grammatical category to which it belongs as, however, he remarks (p 426, § 911) that *alan kṛtvā* signifies "do not," properly, 'enough done,' it might be imagined that the form in *tvā*, in construction with *alan*, is a perfect passive participle, while I am convinced that *alan kṛtvā* properly means "enough with doing," and *kṛtvā* here clearly shews itself to be an abstract substantive in the instrumental (see p 1204 G ed, § 851, Note) It may appear strange that one should find this gerund, or rather the equivalent form in *ya* (on account of the weight of composition), in constructions where, instead of it, a preposition might be used, but even here, too, if we view the said form as the instrumental of an abstract substantive or gerund there is no difficulty; for *atīkramya parvatan nadā*, according to Benfey, "the river behind the mountain," means properly, "the river after crossing the mountain (of the mountain)," i e "the river at which, after crossing the mountain, one arrives," *amaratvam apahāya* (Arj 3 47) may be aptly rendered by "except immortality," but *apahāya* does not thereby become a preposition, for it properly signifies "with abandonment," i e "with exception (of immortality)," and the instrumental termination of the gerund (see § 889) expresses here, as is very usual, the relation "with"

the radical syllable and commonly with Guna of the vowels capable of receiving that augment e g *tī* as lustre (root *ty* to sharpen) *śūr* as id *sā* as might *rān* as quickness *āñ* as id, *tāras* id (root *tar*, *ṭ* / *ri* to step over) *śav* as strength Zend *sa* as 'use (root *su* from *sri* to grow) *ta* as strength (Vid *tu* to grow") *rah* as secret (root *rah* to leave) *mā* as greatness (root *mā* *manh* to grow), *nām* as bending reverence adoration Zend *nēmas*, *tup* as penitence properly the burning *du* as transformation reverence" Vid properly going (root *du* to go)

B) Nenter appellatives with an active and some of them with a passive signification and with accentuation of the root and Guna e g *sār* as pond Vid water as flowing (root *sar* *sri* to move itself) *śru* as hearing Zend *śra* as id (root *śru*) formally the Greek *κλε(φ)-ος*, *chāksh* as eye" as seeing " *rōdh* as coast as hemming in *chēt* as spirit as thinking (root *chint* *chut*) *mān* as id Zend *man* as spirit thought (Greek *μεν-ος* root *man* to think), *srōt* as, stream as 'flowing † *pāya* as water milk

* Like the abstract *chākshas* only in the Vēda dialect where *chāksh* means 'to see

† Root *śru*, with *t* inserted (Unādi IV 203) so also *rēt* as 'seed from *ri* 'to flow' An inserted *th* is found in *pāth* as 'water' (I c 205) as 'being drunk' *N*, too, or *n* is inserted viz in *śp* *n* as 'operation work' together with *āp* as and *śp* as (root *p* 'to obtain' with prep *sam* 'to complete') *ār* as water root *ar* *ri* to move oneself Compare *chatur* *nām* *τεσσαρον* from *chatur* In Latin *pī* *n* us (root *pag*) *faci* *n* us and perhaps *mā* *n* us belong to this class if the latter with respect to its root is connected with the Sanskrit *mā* 'to measure' (with prep *nis* *nir*—*nir mā* to make to produce) In Greek to this class belong words like *δα* *ν* *ς* *κη* *ν* or *δρα* *ν* *ς* *τε* *ρ* *χ* *ν* *ς* Dor *τε* *ρ* *χ* *ν* *ς* (cf *τρ* *χω* *τρι* *χ* *θρ* *κ* *ς* Sanskrit *drih* from *darh* or *drah* 'to grow')

[G Ed p 1373] as "being drunk" (root *pī*, "to drink"); *édh'-as*, "wood," as "about to be burnt" (root *indh*, "to kindle"), *vách-as*, "speech," as "spoken," Zend *𐬯𐬀𐬎𐬌* *vach-as*, id. Here must be ranked some masculine bases in the Vêda dialect like *válshas*, "ox," as "drawing," if it springs, as the Grammarians assume (see Bohtling, Unâdi-suffixes IV 220.), from the root *vah*, with the affix of a sibilant. It might, however, as I prefer supposing, come from *vaksh*, "to grow," so that it would properly signify "the great," like the term for a buffalo, *mahishá*, from another root "to grow." An isolated form is the oxytone feminine *ush-ús*, "aurora," as "shining," Zend *𐬵𐬀𐬎𐬌* *ush-as*, id., likewise feminine, acc *𐬵𐬀𐬎𐬌𐬎𐬎𐬎𐬎* *usháonhēm* = Vêd *ushásam* (root *ush*, "to burn," here "to shine") This word deserves especial notice, because in the Vêda-dialect it exhibits a long *á*,* not only in the nominative singular, but occasionally also in other strong cases, and indeed even in the genitive plural (*ushá-sām*, see Benfey's Glossary) and thus as it were prepares the Latin form [G. Ed p 1374] *aurór-a* (*ó = á*), which, through the appended *a*, has the same relation to the Sanscrit *ushás*, that

grow"), *τέμεν-ος*. The latter contains, like the Latin *faci-n-us*, the class-vowel of the verbal theme. In Zend to this class belongs *𐬵𐬀𐬎𐬌𐬎𐬎𐬎𐬎* *khārē-n-as*, "lustre" (nom acc *khārēnô*, according to § 56^b, gen *khārēnanh-ô*, according to § 56^a), from the root *khār* = Sanscrit *sva*, "to shine" (see § 35 and § 815 last Note), the *ε* of which is explained by § 30. With Sanscrit formations which insert a *t*-sound, like *σιό-τ-ας*, *πά-τ-ας*, we might compare the Greek *μέγε-θ-ος*, in case it does not come from *μέγας*, but, like the latter, from the obsolete root (which, too, has lost its verb) *μεγ* = Sanscrit *mah*, *manh*, "to grow."

* The form *ushás-á*, at the beginning of copulative compounds, shews itself to be the Vêdic dual termination of the base *ushás*, as the Vêda dialect, as has already been elsewhere remarked, admits also, in the first member of such compounds, the dual termination

oper a has to *oper* the theme of the oblique cases of *opus* = Sanscrit *ap-as* work **

C) Adjectives with the signification of the present participle which in combination with the substantive preceding and standing in the accusative relation appear partly as appellatives, but in the Vedic dialect which is here of special importance to us retain in composition too their adjective natures. The following are Vedic examples *nri chakshas* seeing men *nri manas* thinking of men *nri vâhas* bearing man or men *stôma-vâhas* bringing hymns of praise *visâ-dha y as* bearing all (with euphony see § 43) *risadas* (*risa adas* consum [G Ed p 1375] ing the foes. To this class belongs the Zend *ash aôj as* destroying purity if Burnouf's analysis of

* From the Vedic instrumental *ushad bhis* for which probably the form *ushad bhyas* will occur as dative and ablative and *ushatsu* as locative. I should not choose to infer with Benfey (Grammar, p 140) that *as* has arisen from *at* of the present participle as *s* in Sanscrit, in the common language too is changed, according to fixed laws into *t* hence *eg* from *tas* to dwell the future *lat sy mi* and aorist *âtat sam*. Moreover the *s* of our suffix proves itself by the cognate Greek Latin German Lithuanian and Slavonic forms to be a sibilant existing there before the period of the separation of languages and which in the Vedic Sanscrit in the word under discussion at the beginning of compounds passes over into *r* (*ushar budh* waking early). I likewise recall attention to the fact that the base word *ap* water allows its *p* before the *bh* of the case terminations to be changed into *d* without its being possible to thence infer that *ap* on which are based the Latin *agua* and Gothic *ahia* river has proceeded from *ad* or *at*. I would rather assume with Weber (V S Sp 1 18) that only the forms with *d* belong to a base *at* (root *at* to move oneself). However suitable this root to which the said learned man has also assigned a numerous family may be for an appellation of water. I nevertheless prefer assuming that the circumstance that in forms like *ab bhyas* the base separates itself less sharply from the termination than if the termination were preceded by a mute of a different organ has given occasion for the change of the *p* into *d*.

this word is right ("Études," p. 167). In the Vêda dialect there are also simple adjectives of this kind with the accent on the suffix, *e g*, *tar-ús*, "quick," properly "hastening," contrasted with *tánas*, "quickness," *tavús*, "strong," properly, "grown," contrasted with *táv-as*, "strength," *mahús*, "great," likewise, originally, "grown"; *apús*, "acting" (as "warrior, sacrificer," see Benfey's Glossary to the S V. s v), contrasted with *úpas*, "work," *ayús*, "going, hastening, quick" (see Benfey l c). The latter lengthens the *a* of the suffix in the same way as *ushús*. *Yáś-ús*, "famed" (contrasted with *yáśas*, "glory"), has a passive signification, properly, "praised" (cf Zend *ā-yēśēd*, "I praise, I glorify," see § 28)

934. To *A*) correspond Greek abstracts in *os*, *c(σ)-os*†, *e g*, *ψεῦδ-ος*, *μῆδ-ος*, *γῆθ-ος*, *λῆθ-ος* (= Sanscrit *ráh-as*, see §. 933 *A*), *κῆδ-ος*, *φλέγ-ος*, (Vêd. *bhárḡ-as*, "lustre," for *bhráj-as*, root *bhráj*, "to shine," from *bhrág*), *ῥδ-ος* ("the sitting")‡, *πάθ-ος*,

[G Ed p 1376] *μάθ-ος*, *θάρσ-ος*. A feminine base in *os*, with a pervading *o*-sound, and lengthening of the same in the nominative, is *αἰδ-ός*, whence *αἰδῶ-ς*, *αἰδέ(σ)-ος*. As secondary suffix, also, *os*, *cs* appears in Greek as a means of formation

* Cf *mahát*, "great," from the same root, properly a present participle with the signification of the perfect participle, and with the anomaly that the strong cases lengthen the *a*, and thus exhibit *mahánt* for *mahant*

† See § 128. The difference in vowels between *os* and *ε(σ)-os*, &c, probably rests on this, that in loading the base with the case-terminations, the language prefers the lighter substitute of the old *a* to the heavier, in remarkable agreement with the Old Slavonic, where, *e g*, the Sanscrit *nābhas* and Greek *νέφος* are paralleled by the form НЕБО *nebo*, but the genitive *nabhas-as*, *νέφε(σ)-ος* by the form НЕБЕЦЕ *nebes-e* (cf the somewhat different view at § 264)

‡ The corresponding Sanscrit *sád as* has, in common Sanscrit, assumed the signification "assembling," but occurs in the Vêdas also with that of "seat" (so Yajur-Vêda, 19 59). Regarding the Latin *sedē-s* (see p 1352 G ed § 924)

of neuter abstracts and occasionally with a vowel increment in compensation for the abbreviation of the adjective base words (cf p 396), hence *e g*, γαλῶκ *os* from γαλκυ *s*, ἔρευθ *os* from ἐρυθρο-*s* μήκ *os* from μακρο-*s*. Perhaps also the Zend neuter abstracts *𐬰𐬀𐬭𐬀* *frathas*, breadth *𐬰𐬀𐬭𐬀* *as*, length, *mazas* greatness *𐬰𐬀𐬭𐬀* *as* height * are of adjective descent, and like the said Greek forms have dropped the suffix of the base word before the formative of the abstract. Very remarkable is the almost literal agreement between *𐬰𐬀𐬭𐬀* *frathas* and the Greek πλατος, *ban* *as* corresponds to βαθ *os* and radically to the Sanscrit *bahu* (probably from *badhu*) much and still more to the comparative वृहिय *bunhiyas* and superlative वृहिश्रुति *bunhishthia* which are indeed derived from *bahula* but which may with equal justness be assigned to वृ *bahu*. The root is *banh* to grow *𐬰𐬀𐬭𐬀* *maz as* greatness answers to μήκ *os* the κ of which as also that of μακρο-*s* is probably only a mutation of γ and I have scarce a doubt that these two words belong to one and the same root with μεγα *s* which root is in Sanscrit *manh* and signifies 'to grow'. The Vedic sister word to *𐬰𐬀𐬭𐬀* *maz as* and μήκος is *mah as* which certainly signifies not only brightness (see Benfey's Glossary) but also and indeed primitively greatness and I believe that this abstract proceeds not directly from the root but just like *mah i man* of equivalent signification from *mahát* or another adjective of the same root signifying great. To the Zend *frathas* [G Ed p 137]

"breadth" there may still be found in the Vedas a corresponding *práth as* of similar meaning as derivative from *prithu* and for *beriz at* (strong *berer ant*) height we actually find the corresponding Sanscrit sister word in the first member of the compound name *brihas páti* (in the common language *vrthas*) in as far as it signifies as I be

have it originally does, "lord of greatness." The Latin exhibits the Sanscrit neuter suffix *as* in four shapes, but principally in that of *us*, *ei-us** The other forms are *us*, *oi-us*, *ui*, *oi-us*, and *ui*, *ur-us*. For the class of words under discussion (§ 933 *A.*), the Latin neuter suffix furnishes but a few remnants, obscured as to their root, viz. *rób-ur* (cf *rób-us-tus*, see §. 827), which, like the Vêdic *táv-as*, "strength," comes from a root which signifies "to grow"†, as *fæd-us*,‡ and *scel-us*, (*sceles-tus*) § In Latin, in case of the suffix under discussion as a formative of abstract substantives, the neuter is replaced by the masculine, and, indeed, with a lengthening of the vowel (*ûi*, from *âs*), which, however, in the nominative, through the influence of the final *i*, is again [G Ed p 1378] shortened. With respect to the vowel length of the true base word, compare the strong cases and the genitive plural of the above-mentioned (pp 1373, 1375, G. ed) forms *ushûs* and *ay-ûs* in the Vêda dialect, e g, the accusative singular *ush-ûs-am*, *ay-ûs-am*, with *flu-ôr-em*, *langu-ôi-em*, *rud-ôr-em*, *frem-ôr-em*, *trem-ôi-em*, *ang-ôr-em*, *pud-ôr-em*, *sap-ôr-em*, *od-ôr-em* (Greek root *ôð*), *fulg-ôre-m*, *sop-ôr-em*, *son-ôi-em*, *am-ôi-em*, &c The *s* of the old nominatives like *clamûs* is, perhaps, not the original final consonant of the base, but the nominative sign before

— — — — —

* See § 22 The *e* of the oblique cases, for *i*, which might be expected according to §. 6, owes its origin to the following *r* (cf § 710)

† Sanscrit root *ruh*, "to grow," from *rudh*, and *ridh*, id, from *radh* or *adh* (see § 1) With *ruh*, from *rudh*, compare the Irish *ruadh*, "strength, power, value," as adjective "strong, valiant," see Glossarium Sanscrit 1847, and Ag Benary, "Doctrine of Roman Sounds," p 218 With reference to the Latin *b* for *dh* we must note the relation of *ruber* to the Sanscrit *rudhiram*, "blood," and Greek *ἐρυθρός*

‡ From *foidus*, from the root *fid* With regard to the Guna, compare the Greek *πείρωθα*

§ Cf Sanscrit *chhalâ-m* (see § 14), "guile, deceit," probably from *chhad*, "to cover," with *l* for *d* (see § 17)

which the base has dropped its final consonant (see § 138) This suffix forms in Latin abstracts from adjective bases also hence *e g* *amaror* *nigror* *albior*

935 The Gothic has added an *a* to the sibilant which has become incapable of declension and has weakened the preceding vowel to *i*. As in the uninflected nominative and accusative singular neuter the final *a* of the base is dropped we obtain here the forms *hat is* hate, *ag is* fear *, *rim is* rest † *sig is* 'victory' *riqvis* gloom ‡ Perhaps the *s* of *hulistr* (theme *hulistra*) [G Ed p 1379] is not *is* has been conjectured above (see § 818 p 1113) a euphonic insertion but *hulis* is a lost abstract with the suffix *is* and the suffix *tra* appended Moreover some neuter bases in *sla* appear to me to have abstracts in *is* with *i* suppressed as primitive bases for their foundation I mean the forms *hun s l* (theme *hunsla*) sacrifice from *hun is l* from a lost root *han* or *hun* *svum s l* pond as place

— —

Root *ag* whence *og* I feared according to form a preterite The Old High German *ekiso* theme *ekison* has exchanged the neuter with the masculine and further added to the base an *n* but preserved the old sibilant in which it survives the suffix *tra* which in § 941, is compared with the Sanscrit *as*

† Sanscrit root *ram* with prep *ā* (*āram*) to rest Lithuanian *rimstu* 'I rest' Lettish *rahms* (=rams) tame quiet sedate The Greek *ῥημα ῥημω &c*, answer in their *η* to the Sanscrit compound *āram* It is not improbable that in the adverb *ῥημας* (before vowels) the suffix under discussion is contained in its original form Moreover the *es* of the comparative *ῥημσ* *σ*-*ρ* *s* appears to me to belong to the suffix *as* as *σ* according to regular rule has its etymologically established place before the suffixes *τ* *ρ* *σ* and is dislodged in some places only by a mis-use and driven where it does not belong

‡ It has already been compared in my Glossary, with the analogous Sanscrit *rajās* This word from the root *rañj* ('*adhærere tingere*'), signifies indeed not darkness but dust but from the same root is derived by another suffix a term for night (*rajanī*) and *rajas* is contained in the compound *rajo ra a* gloominess.

of swimming" (root, *svamm*, weakened to *svimm*, *svumm*). *Svart-is-l*, "blackness," presupposes a more simple abstract *svart-is*, which would correspond to the Greek secondary abstracts like $\beta\acute{\alpha}\theta\text{-}\sigma\varsigma$, and, irrespective of gender, to Latin like *nigr'-or*, *alb'-or*. More important appears to me the deduction, that most probably the Sanscrit suffix *as* has been preserved in Gothic in combination with another suffix assigned to abstracts, and, indeed, with the retention of the old *a*-sound. I believe, viz that the Gothic masculine abstracts in *as-su-s*, as, e g, *drauhtin-as-su-s*, "military service" (*drauhtinô*, "I do military service"), *frauyin-as-su-s*, "lordship" (*frauyin-ô*, "I rule"), *leikin-as-su-s*, "healing" (*leikinô*, "I heal"), may be explained by assimilation from *as-tu-s*, as, e g, *vis-sa*, "I knew," from *vis-ta* for *vit-ta*, and, in Latin, *quas-sum*, from *quas-tum* for *quat-tum* (see § 102) Most of the formations of this kind are based on weak verbs in *in-ô*, the analogy of which is followed, also, by *thuudin-as-su-s*, "government, dominion," though the base word [G Ed p 1380] *thu-danô* has an *a* before the *n*, which, however, without reference to the verbs in *in-ô*, might have been weakened to *i* on account of the incumbrance of the heavy double suffix (cf § 6) Irrespective of the newly-appended suffix *su*, from *tu*, *leikin'-as-sus* has the same relation to *leikinô*, with reference to the suppression of the *ô* of the verbal theme, that in Latin, e g, the abstracts *am'-or*, *clam'-or*, have to the verbal themes *amâ*, *clamâ*, where the *â* corresponds to the Gothic *ô* = Sanscrit अय (see § 109^a 6) Further, from adjective bases are derived, in Gothic, some abstracts in *as-su-s*, viz *ibn'-as-sus*, "similarity," from *ibna*, nom m *ibns*, "like," and *vanin-as-sus*, "want" The latter, however, springs, not from the strong adjective bases *vana*, nom m. *vans*, "wanting," but from the weak base *vanan*, the *a* being weakened to *i*, as in the genitive and dative *vanin-s*,

^a See Grimm, II 175 321, and Gabelentz and Lobe, Grammar, p 118

vanin From the preposition *ufar* over (Sanskrit *upari*) comes *ufar-as su s* overflowing "a form remarkable as being the only one in which the abstract double suffix is not preceded by an *n* of the primitive base. In the more modern dialects the *n* which belongs in Gothic to the base word has by an abuse completely passed over into the derivative suffix which hence begins universally with *n* distinguishes the genders, and has changed the Gothic *n* of the second part of the double suffix into *a* or *i* (Grimm II 723). To this class belong e.g. the Old High German feminine *arauc-nissa* or *-nissi* *inomit daho* "our *Freigniss* or more properly *Iraigniss* occurrence") *dei nissa* and *dei nissi* *trinitas* " (Anglo-Saxon *dlre ness*) *milt nissa* *misericordia* (English mildness), *li hor nissi* *auhtus* " *perahit nissi* *berahit nissi* *splendor* " (English bright ness) the neuter *get nissi* (theme *nissya*) *du nissas* " *fir stant nissi* *int l lectus* " (our *Verstandniss* understanding) *suaz nissi* *ihul cedo* " (English sweet-ness")

936 Some Old High German bases in [G I a p 1761] *us ta us ti* or *os ta os ti* appear to contain a combination of two suffixes * viz. *us* or *os* (=Sanskrit *as*) and *ta* or *ti*. The following are examples *dur us ta nam dijonst* in Otf. *thionost* our *Dienst* service in Old High German neuter, *ang us ti f* anxiety, nom *ang us t*, *ern us ta n* and *ern us ti f* earnest nom *ern us t* (see Grass I 179) *Ang us ti* is connected in its first suffix with the first of the Latin adjectives *ang us ta* as also with that of the abstract *ang or*. The Lithuanian too, exhibits some abstracts with two suffixes combined of which the first is connected with the *as* under discussion and the latter with the *ti* discussed above e.g. *gyu as ti s m* life and *rim as ti s m* rest †

* See Grimm, II 308 and 371 β

† Also the Lithuanian abstracts mentioned at p 1102 C ed., § 841 are masculine and have extended the suffix by an inorganic *a* which is suppressed

The former, after withdrawal of the second suffix, answers to the base of the Sanscrit infinitive *jīu-ús-é*, "in order to live," the latter to the above-mentioned (§ 935) Gothic *rim-is* (theme *rim-isa*), "rest" In *ed-esi-s*, "food" (theme *edesia*, see § 135), perhaps originally "the eating," and in *deg-esi-s*, "the month August," as "burning," I recognise the Sanscrit suffix *as* with the affix *ia*, which, in general, the Lithuanian loves to append to suffixes which originally terminate with a consonant. With reference to this I recall attention to the participles of the present and perfect (§. 787) -

937 To the Sanscrit appellatives mentioned in § 933 under *B*), correspond some of their literatim analogous appellatives in Greek, as ἔλ-ος, ἔλκ(σ)-ος (§ 128) = Sanscrit *sāra-s*, "pond, water," as "flowing," μῆν-ος = *mān-as*, "spirit," as "thinking," φλέγ-ος = Vêdic abstract *bhārg-as*, "shining,"

[G Ed p 1382] ῥέ-ος = *srô-t-as*, "river" (see p 1372, Note 2, G ed, § 933 *B*) Note), σκῦ-τ-ος, "skin," as "covering", στῆ-θ-ος, (see Curtius l c, p. 20 and cf *εὔστα-θ-ής*), ὄχ-ος (cf Sanscrit *vāh-as*, "driving, drawing"), ἐπ-ος, from *Fék-ος* = Sanscrit *vāch-as*, from *vāk-as*, τέκ-ος, γέν-ος. In Latin to this class belong, *e g*, *ol-us*, *ol-ei-is*, from *ol-is-is*, "greens," as "growing," *gen-us*, *fulg-ur*, *corp-us*, "body," as "made" (see p 1069, Note |), *pec-us*, *pecor-is*, "beast," as "tied up" (Sanskrit *paśú-s*, root *paś*, from *pak*, "to bind"), *vell-us*, *op-us* (= Sanscrit *āp-as*, "work") To the *u* arising from *a* of the uninflected cases corresponds accidentally the corruption which the Sanscrit suffix *as* has experienced in the form *us*, by which neuter appellatives are formed which, for the most part, accent the root (Unâdi, II p 113) The following are examples *cháksk-us*, "an eye," as "seeing" (op-

suppressed in the nominative In the genitive the words mentioned l c. are *smérchio*, &c

* Latin *cu-ti-s*, Sanscrit root *sku*, "to cover," see Benf, Gr Root-Lex, p 611, and cf, with respect to the inserted *τ*, the abstract *χῆ-τ-ος*

posed to the Vedic *cháksh-as*) *yaj us* sacrifice *dhan us* (also *mrse*) bow "as slaying (root *han* from *dhan* to slay in-*dhana* death) *tanus* body "as extended *janus* birth in the Vedic dual (*janushí*) the two worlds "as created (S V II 6 2 17) in admirable agreement with the Latin *genus* (Greek *γενος*) of cognate formation. The Vedic adjective *yaj us* conquering irrespective of the weakening of the vowel corresponds to the above-quoted (§ 931 under C) adjectives like *taras* quick. I regard, too, the suffix *is* which forms some abstracts and appellatives for the most part oxtonic as a weakening of *as*. Examples are *śák is* n lustre " (root *śukh*) *arch is* f ul *havi is* n clarified sacrificial butter (root *hu* to sacrifice) *chhad is* (optionally *mrse*) roof (root *chad* to cover) *jyot is* n shewn [C III p 173] star (root *jyut* to shine). Observe the accidental coincidence as respects the weakening of the vowel with the Gothic suffix *isa* from *agis* fear " &c (§ 932). Perhaps the Latin *cinis cin er is* from *cin is* belongs in respect of its suffix to this class in which case its original signification would be the glowing ashc and it would be radically akin to कृ *kan* to shine.

933 To the Vedic formations mentioned in § 931 under C) like *chakshas* 'seeing' *manas* 'thinking' at the end of compounds correspond irrespective of their accentuation the numerous class of Greek bases like *δεσπεις* (αδεσπεις *όξυ δεσπεις*) *αμεις* (ευαμεις), *δεχεις* (-αιδεχεις) *λαβεις* (ευλαβεις *μεσολαβεις*) and with n passive signification e g *βαφεις* (-ο λυβαφεις &c) *δρυφεις* (αμφιδρυφεις). In Greek as well as in Sanscrit we must distinguish from this class of words the possessive compounds the last member of which is in its simple state a neuter substantive base in *an us es* as e g

In the Veda dialect in this meaning also masculine see Weber V S, Sp II 74

सुमनस् *sumánas*, "having a good spirit, well-intentioned" = Greek *εὐμενής*, nom. in f. *sumánás*, *εὐμενῆς* (see § 146.). To the simple oxytone adjectives mentioned in § 933 C) as *tarás*, nom m f *tarás*, "hastening, quick," corresponds in Greek *ψευδής*, *ψευδῆς*, which stands to the corresponding abstract *ψῦδος*, in a similar relation as regards accent to that occupied by the *tarás* mentioned above to *táras*, "quickness."

939. The suffixes *ra* and *la*, fem *rá*, *lá*, I consider, on account of the very common interchange between *r* and *l* (see §. 20), as originally one; and I regard as class-vowels, or vowels of conjunction,* the vowels which precede these liquids, as also the mutes *k*, *t*, and *th*, in several

[G Ed p 1384] suffixes given by the Indian Grammarians, *ara*, *ura*, *éa*, *óa*, *ala*, *ila*, *ula*, *aha*, *áha*, *ika*, *uka*, *atira*, *itra*, *utira*, *athu* With *ra*, *la*, *a-la*, *i-la*, *u-la*, *i-ra*, *u-ra*, are formed base words like *díp-rá*, "shining," *śubh-rá*, "dazzling, white," *bhád-ra*, "happy, good," *chand-rá*, m "moon," as "giving light†, *śúk-la*, "white" (Vêd *śuk-rá*, "giving light, shining") (root *śuch*, from *śuk*, "to shine"), *chap-a-lá*, "tremulous, shaking" (root *champ*, "to move"), *tar-a-lá*, "shaking" (root *tar*, *tí*, "to overstep," "to move oneself"), *mud-i-rá*, m "voluptuary," *chhid-i-rá*, m. "axe, sword" (root *chhid*, "to cleave"), *an-i-lá*, m "wind" (*an*, "to breathe," cf Irish *anal*, "breath"), *path-i-lá*, m.

* The *é* and *ó* of a small number of rare words, *e g* *pat-é-ra*, "moving itself" (as subst masc *pat-é-ra-s*, "hind"), *sáh-ó-ra*, "good" (root *sah*, "to endure"), are perhaps the Gunas of the vowels *i* and *u*, which are often found inserted as copulatives.

† Regarding *a-tira*, *i-tra*, see p 1108 The *u* of *var-ú-tra*, "upper garment," as "covering," is either only a weakening of the *a* of *a-tira*, or the character of the 8th class, which is merely an abbreviation of the syllable *nu* of the 5th, to which *var*, *vi*, belongs It is certain that the *v* of the radically and formally cognate Greek *ἐλν-τρο-ν* belongs to the verbal theme Cf the Sanscrit root *val*, Cl I, "to cover"

‡ Cf Latin *candeo*, *candê-la*, the latter also as respects the suffix

traveller *panth* to go) *uid u-rá* knowing wise
blud u rá m thunderbolt (*blud* to cleave) *harsh u la*
 in lover antelope (*harsh hrish* to rejoice)

910 To this class of words belong in Zend *𐬰𐬀𐬭𐬀* *suc ra* shining = *𐬰𐬀* *subh ra* (see § 15) *𐬰𐬀𐬭𐬀* *suc ra*
 shining clear = Ved *suk-ra* *𐬰𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬀𐬭𐬀* *janfra* month as
 speaking" (cf *𐬰𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬀𐬭𐬀* *janfau* § 61) *𐬰𐬀𐬭𐬀* *su ra* strong
 (San *su rá* hero root *su* contracted *su* to grow) In
 Greek this class of words is more numerous than in Sanscrit
 To adjectives like *dip ru s* correspond [G Ed p. 138.]
 as regards accent also such as *λαμπ ρος* *λιβ ρος*, *λυγ ρος*
ικ ρος (cf *ικευς* Latin *ne-c-s* Sanscrit *nas* to be runned")
ψυχ ρος *ψηχ ρος* *θεω ρος* In Latin to this class belong
gna rus ple ru s ju ru s (Sanskrit *pu* to purify) *ca ru s*
 (San *lam* to love") *pi g er theme pi g ru* in *leg-er theme*
integ ru In the Gothic a remnant of this class of words
 is found in the masculine base *lig ra* nom *lig r s* couch
 The *a* of the Old High German neuter theme *ligar-a* is
 probably a later insertion (cf p 1112) but if not the suffix
 belongs to the Sanscrit *as* (see § 933.) whither most pro-
 bably *dem ar* (likewise neuter) twilight compared with
 the Sanscrit *támas* gloom" is to be referred To San-
 scrit adjectives like *dip-rá* giving light correspond the
 bases *bait ra* bitter properly biting and *fag-ra*
 suitable good (cf *fullafahyan* to satisfy to serve)
 I refer the Greek suffix *λο*, as originally identical with *po*
 rather to the Sanscrit *ra* than to *la* and therefore to the
 oxytones mentioned above (§ 939) *dip ru s subh rá s* I refer
 the Greek *δελος* *αυλος* *βηλος* *δαλος* *στρεβ-λος*, *εκπαγ*
λος *σιγηλος* *φειδωλος* * In Latin to this class belongs
sil la from *sed lu* (=Greek *ἔδρα*) with a passive signifi-
 cation so Gothic *sil la m* nom *sil's* rest as place

The *η* and *ω* of *σιγη λος* *φειδω λος* belong to the verbal theme
 (cf *σγησω*), and for the latter we may presuppose a verb *φεδω*

where sitting takes place," *fair-veit-la*, n. (nom acc *fair-veit-l*) "stage" The Old High German, in order to avoid the harshness of two final consonants coming together, inserts an *a* in the nominative and accusative singular, which theme has often made its way into the oblique cases (cf p 1112), and often assumes the weaker form of *u*, *i*, *e*. To this class belong, *e g*, the masculines *sez-a-l* or *sezz-a-l*, "a chair,"

[G Ed p 1386] *sat-a-l*, "a saddle," also *sat-u-l*, *sat-i-l*, *sat-e-l*, *huot-i-l*, "warder," *mûn-huot-i-la*, "custodes muronum" (Graf, IV. 803), *fôzkengel*, "foot-traveller" (Grimm, II 109, Graf, IV. 104), *bit-e-l*, "*procus*," *pit-al-a*, "*proci, nuptiarum petitores*" (Graf, III 56), *stein-bruk-i-l*, "stone breaker," *sluoz-i-l*, "key," as "locking," accusative plural *sluoz-i-la*, *stôz-i-l*, "pestle" The following are examples of Old High German adjectives of this order of formation (Grimm, II. 102) *scad-a-l*, "*noxius*," *slâf-a-l*, "*somnulentus*," *spunk-a-l*, "*exultans*," *suk-a-l*, "*taciturnus*"

941. To the Sanscrit formations like *chap-a-lâ-s*, *tar-a-lâ-s*, "trembling" (see § 939), correspond, in Lithuanian, *dang-a-la-s*, "covering" (*dengti*, "I cover"), *draug-a-la-s*, "the companion," masc, *draug-a-la*, fem (*drauga*, "I have communion with another"), and, with passive signification, *myz-a-lai*, (pl) "urine" (*myzù*, "*mingo*"), *vēm-a-lai*, (pl) "the discharged," in Greek, forms with *α* inserted, or with *ε* which has proceeded therefrom, as, τροχ-α-λό-ς, τραπ-ε-λό-ς, στυφ-ε-λό-ς, αἶθ-α-λο-ς, διδάσκ-α-λο-ς, μργ-α-λο (Gothic *mik-i-la*, nom *mik-i-l*-s, Sanscrit root, *mah*, "to grow"), εἶκ-ε-λο-ς, and the reduplicated κκρῦφ-ε-λο-ς, δυσπέμφ-ε-λο-ς, εὐπέμπ-ε-λο-ς. To *vid-u-râ-s*, "knowing," correspond φλεγ-υ-ρό-ς, ἐχ-υ-ρό-ς, to forms like *harsh-u-lâ-s* "lover, antelope," properly, "rejoicing," correspond, in respective of accentuation, εἶδ-υ-λο-ς (cf *vid-u-râ-s*), καμπ-ύ-λο-ς The weakening, however, of the vowel of conjunction *a* to *ũ*, appears to have been arrived at by the two languages independently of each other, so the Latin, in analogous formatives like *trem-u-*

lu s ger u lu s strid u lu s fig u lu s cing u lu m *vinc u lu m*
spec-u lu m leg u lu m leg u la reg u la mus cip-u la am ic
-u lu m where the *l* may have had its influence in producing
u from *a*. As from *a la* in Sanscrit we may deduce *a ru*
 we may here call attention to Greek forms like *στειβ α πο-ς*
φαι-ε πο-ς *λακ ε πο-ς* and to Latin *hle* [G Ld p 1387]
len e r gen-e r (theme *len-e ru gen e ru*) if the *e* of the lat-
 ter does not on account of the *r* following stand for *i*. To
 the form *इह i la* (*an i la s* "wind" as blowing) belongs
 perhaps the Latin *i li* in adjectives like *ag i li s frag i li s*
fac i li s doc i li s (see § 119 sub f) for which if the con-
 nection be justly assumed we should have expected *ag i*
lu s &c. I would draw attention to forms like *imberbus*
inermis for the more organic *imberbu s inermu s* (see § 6)

912 As secondary suffixes *ra* *la* (*i ra i la* *ir a i lu*)
 form a small number of oxytone adjectives as e.g. *ásmaru*
 stony from *ásmān* stone *mádhuru* sweet properly
 gifted with honey from *mádhū* honey (cf *μεθυ*) *sri la*
 fortunate Zend *𐬰𐬀𐬭𐬀 sri ra* from *sri* luck *pānsu lu*
 dusty from *pānsu* dust *phēna la* forming from *phēnn*
 form *mēdh i rá medh i lá* intelligent from *mēdhā*
 understanding. In Greek this secondary formation also
 of words is more numerously represented than in San-
 scrit. I refer the vowel which precedes the *ρ* in all cases
 to the base word and take the *e* of words like *φθειρ-πο-ς*
ιοσε πο-ς *κρυε-πο-ς* *ιοε-πο-ς*, *φαεε-πο-ς* *δολε-πο-ς* *σκεε-πο-ς*
βλαβε πο-ς according to the measure of the termination of

* Perhaps the words would be better divided thus *mēlhu ra mēdhu la*
 and we might recognise in the *i* the weakening of the *a* of the primitive
 base in the same way as in Latin the final vowels of the primitive bases
 are weakened to *i* before various derivative suffixes e.g. *carī ta amar-
 tudo*. The *u* of words like *laurá* having a projecting tooth is pro-
 bably likewise only a weakening of the final vowel of the base word
 (*dánta* tooth) a weakening which the Celtic *tunthu s* also has under-
 gone in its simple state

the base word, as the thinning or shortening of *o*, *α*, or *η*.^{*}

[G Ed p 1388.] Conversely, lengthenings of *o* to *η* (= *ω*, see § 4) also occur, hence, *e.g.*, *νοση-ρό-ς*, *μοχθη-ρό-ς* (cf *μοχθή-εις*), *οἰνη-ρό-ς*. The old *α*, of which *o*, *ε*, are the most common corruptions, has maintained itself in *μυσα-ρό-ς* (later *μυσσ-ρό-ς*), *λιπα-ρό-ς*, *σθενα-ρό-ς* the latter from the base *σθένος*, *σθένες*, the suffix of which corresponds to the Sanscrit *as* (see § 934) and in *λαμυ-ρό-ς*. *ἀργυ-ρό-ς*, has been weakened to *υ*.† A vowel of conjunction is found in *αἵματ-η-ρό-ς*, *ὕδρ-η-ρό-ς*. To *πάνσυ-λά-ς*, “dusty,” *πλένα-λά-ς*, “foamy,” correspond forms like *ρίγη-λό-ς* (scarcely from *ρίγέω*, but from *ρίγος*, as above *σθενα-ρό-ς* from *σθένος*), *χαμα-λό-ς*, *στωμύ-λο-ς* (for *στωμα-λο-ς*). I would now, too, in departure from § 119., rather refer to this class those Latin formations in *li*, which spring from substantives. Consequently the *ā* after bases ending in a consonant in forms like *caeni-ā-lis*, *augur-ā-lis*, &c., would be to be regarded as a vowel of conjunction equally with the Greek *η* of the *αἵματ-η-ρό-ς*, *ὕδρ-η-ρό-ς*, just mentioned. The vowel relation of *li* to *la*, *lo*, is the same as, *e.g.*, in the genitive singular that of *ped-is* to *ped-ās*, *pod-ós*.

943 To the Sanscrit primary suffix *ri*, which occurs only in a few words of rare use, *e.g.*, in *ānh-ri-s*, and *āngh-ri-s*, masc, “foot,” as “going” (root *anh* and *angh*, “to go”), corresponds the Greek *ρι* of *ἰδ-ρι-ς*, *ἰδ-ρι*, for which, in Sanscrit, *vid-ri-s*, *-ri*, would be expected. The Latin has prefixed to the suffix *ri* a vowel of conjunction in *cel-e-ri*, theme *cel-e-ri*, the *i* of which, together with the case-sign, has been suppressed in the nominative masculine. The obsolete root *cel* (*ex-cello*, *præ-cello*) corresponds to the Greek *κελ* (*κέλλω*), whence *κέλης*, “runner,” and to the Sanscrit *śal* (from *kal*), “to go, to run” (as yet not found as a verb).

* Cf p 1367, Note, G ed

† Cf *νόξ*, contrasted with the Sanscrit *nakṭam* (adv. “by night”) and other *nx*, and *ῥ-νοξ* with the Sanscrit *nakhā*

To this class moreover belong in Latin [G Ed p 1389] *put e-r* theme *put ri* and *ac er** theme *ac-ri* which limit the inorganic *e* to the nominative masculine where it cannot be dispensed with after the *r* of the base is dropped. The cause of the retention of the inserted *e* throughout the word *cel e r* is the awkwardness of the combination *lr*.

944 Of the words in Sanscrit formed with the suffix *ru* (they are collectively but few) there are only two in common use viz the adjective *bhī ru s* fearing fearful fem likewise *bhī ru s* or *bhī ru s* neut *bhī rú* and the neuter substantive *as ru* a tear which I look upon as a mutilated form of *das ru* and derive from *dans* from *dank* to bite (Greek *δακ*). In Greek *δακνυ* corresponds to it and in Gothic as far as the root is concerned the masculine *tag r s* theme *tag ra* = Sanscrit *ás ra* neut also a tear. For *भीरु bhī ru* fearful there exists also the form *bhī lu* to which answers in respect of its suffix the Gothic *ag lu s* heavy cumbersome. To *bhī ru s* fearing fearful correspond the Lithuanian adjectives *byau ru s* ugly (cf *byau* I fear *bai m̃* fear) *bud ru s* watchful (*bundu* I watch Sanscrit *budh* to know caus to wake) *ēd-ru s* gluttonous and some others from obsolete roots.

945 The Sanscrit suffix *va* fem *vā* forms appellatives which express the agent and also a few adjectives most of them with the accent on the radical syllable. The most current word of this class is *as-va s* horse as runner { which has been widely diffused over the [G Ed p 1390]

* The original meaning of *acer* appears to be penetrating and like *ac u s* it seems to belong to the Sanscrit root *as* from *ak* (see § 9 p 1307 G Ed Note †). Cf the Sanscrit *as ri s* fem the sharpness of a sword which I would rather derive from *as*, with the suffix *ri* than with the Indian Grammarians from *sri* to go with the prefix *ā* shortened.

† Cf the radically cognate *as u* 'quick' see p 1300 G Ed

cognate languages too Latin *equu-s*, Lithuanian *ász-wa*, "a mare," Greek ἵππο-ς, from ἵκκο-ς (by assimilation from ἵκ-*Fo*-ς), Old Saxon *ehu*, in the compound *ehu-scalc*, "*servus equarius*," Zend 𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬎 *aš-pa* (see § 50). The following are other examples in Sanscrit of extremely rare use *khát-vá*, f. "bed" (root *khatt*, "to cover"), *pád-va-s*, "car," as "going," *prúsh-va-s*, "sun," as "burning" We find an example of an adjective in *rísh-va*, "affronting," as also in the oxytone *pak-vá*, with a passive signification, "cooked," "ripe" In Gothic the adjective base *las-i-va*, nom *las-i-v'-s*, "weak," from an obsolete root, appears to belong to this class of words In Latin, *v* must, after consonants, except *r*, *l*, and *q* (*qu* = *cv*), become *u*, therefore *uu* = *va* in adjectives like *de-cid-uu-s*, *oc-cid-uu-s*, *re-sid-uu-s*, *vac-uu-s*, *noc-uu-s*, *con-tig-uu-s*, *as-sid-uu-s* On the other hand, *de-clí-vu-s*, *tor-vu-s*, *pro-terí-vu-s*, *al-vu-s* (properly, "the nourishing") An *i* as vowel of conjunction is found in *cad-í-vu-s*, *recid-í-vu-s*, *vao-í-vu-s*, *noc-í-vu-s* To 𐬒𐬀𐬎𐬎 *pak-vá-s*, "cooked," "ripe," correspond, in respect to their passive signification, *e g*, *per-spíc-uu-s*, *in-gen-uu-s*, *pro-misc-uu-s* In Greek the suffix *eu*, in which I formerly imagined I recognised a Guna form of the suffix *v*, may be explained by transposition from *va*, *Fo*, with the thinning of the *o* to *ε*, thus, *e g*, *δρομεύς*, *γραφεύς*, instead of the impossible *δρομ-Fó-ς*, *γραφ-Fó-ς*, and in the secondary formation, *e g*, *ἱππεύς*, properly, "gifted with horses," from *ἱππ-Fó-ς*. The Greek *cv* might also be deduced from the Sanscrit *va*, regarding *v* as the contraction of *va*, as, *e g*, in *ὑπνος* = *svápna-s*, and the *ε* as the vowel of conjunction, whether it stand for *α* or for *ι* In the latter case, *δρομ-ε-ύς* would answer to the above-mentioned (p 1390 G ed) Gothic [G Ed p 1391] base *las-i-va*, and to the Lithuanian for-

* See Schmeller, "*Glossarium Saxonico-Latinum*" The genitive would be *eh-ua-s* or *eh-ue-s*, so that the suffix has been retained very correctly in this word

mations like *stég i u s* 'thatcher', *zind- i u s** 'who sucks much and long' (*zindu* 'I suck') *pacch i u s* 'baker's oven' *c-isch i u s* 'purgatory' (*chist u* 'I purify') | For this class of words and the Greek in *ev* there is however, another source in Sanscrit to which we may betake ourselves for their explanation. I mean the suffix *yu* which like the Greek *ev* has the accent and forms a small number of words (see Bolithong's *Urindi Affixes* p 32) among which are *tas yu s* 'thief' † *jan yu s* 'a living creature' as producing or begotten (cf *jan tu s id*) *sundh yu s* 'fire as purifying' It also forms some abstracts as *bhuy yu s* 'the eating' *man yu s* 'hate' (Zend *main yu s* 'spirit as thinking') and with *t* inserted *mri t yu*, *m f n* 'death'. To this would correspond in Lithuanian *skyr u s* 'separation' (*skiru* 'I separate'). In Gothic perhaps *drun yu s* 'clang' belongs to this class §

946 As regards the origin of the suffix *ia* I believe I recognise in it a pronominal base which occurs in the enclitic *ia* as (according to form a nominative and accusative neuter see § 155) as also in *rd ar* as and besides these only in combination with other demonstrative bases preceding *inter aha* in the Zend *aia* this (see § 377) Perhaps also the reflexive base *ia* (§ 311), on which the old Persian *hūa* 'he' (euphatic for *hva*) is based is nothing but the combination of *sa* with [G Ed p 139.] *ia* the final vowel of the former being suppressed as in *s ya* from *sa ya* this (§ 353)

947 The suffix *ian* forms a) adjectives with the signification of the participle present which occur only at the

* *D-* for *d* on account of the *z* following

† Pott too (E I II p 487) notices a possible relationship between the Greek suffix *u* and the Lithuanian *iu*

‡ The root *tas* 'to take up' which has not yet been met with as a verb here probably signifies 'to take'

§ Cf the Sanscrit *dhtan* 'to sound' and see § 20

end of compounds, especially in the Vêda dialect, *e.g.*, *suta-pâ-van*, "drinking the Sôma," *vâya-dâ-van*, "giving food" *b)* Nouns of agency, like *îl-van*, "extoller," *yây-van*, "sacrificer" *c)* Appellatives, *e.g.*, *rûh-van*, "tree," as "growing," *śâk-van*, "elephant," as "powerful, strong" The Zend furnishes a remarkable word of this class, viz *𐬰𐬀𐬭𐬀 zar-van*, "time," in which I recognise a word radically akin to the Sanscrit *har-i-mân*, which signifies "time," as "carrying away, destroying" (see § 795). The Greek *χρονο-* is referable, in my opinion, with equal facility, to the Sanscrit root *har*, *हरि*, with which, in Greek, obsolete root, *χείρ*, "the hand," as "taking," is also most probably connected. The omission of the radical vowel in *χρόνος*, if we refer the *o* to the suffix, can occasion no doubt, while the suffix *oro* admits of ready comparison with the Sanscrit-Zend *van* With respect to the necessary dropping of the digamma, compare the relation of the suffix *cvr* to the Sanscrit *vant*, and with reference to the vowel added to the final consonant of the suffix, the relation of the Latin *lentu* (with *lent*) to the same suffix (see § 20)

948 The Sanscrit suffix *nu* (see § 851) forms oxytone adjectives and substantives, *e.g.*, *grîdh-nû-s*, "wistful, eager," *tras-nû-s*, "trembling, fearing," *dhîrîsh-nû-s*, "venturing, bold" (*n*, on account of the preceding *sh*), *bhâ-nû-s*, "the sun, as "giving light," *dhê-nû-s*, f "milk-cow," as "giving [G Ed p 1393] to drink" (root *dhê*, "to drink," with causal signification), *sû-nû-s*, "son," as "born" So, in Zend, *𐬰𐬀𐬭𐬀 taf-nu-s*, "burning" (see §. 40), *𐬰𐬀𐬭𐬀 ras-nu-s*, "straightforward, true" |, *𐬰𐬀𐬭𐬀 barêsh-nu-s*, "high, great," as substantive, "summit"[†], *janf-nu-s*, "mouth," as

* Cf Burnouf, "Études," p 197

† Root *𐬰𐬀𐬭𐬀 raz*=Sanskrit *ry* (from *rya*), whence *ryû*, "direct," see Burnouf, "Yagna," p 195

Bri̯z=San *virh*, Vêd *brîh*, "to grow," see Burnouf, "Études," p 194

speaking (see § 61) in Lithuanian mostly from obsolete roots *drung nu s* (also *drung na s*) lukewarm *gad nu s* fit *mac-nu s* powerful (cf *maci s* might Gothic *mah ts* Sanscrit *manh mah* to grow Latin *mag nus*) *sau nu s* able doughty (cf Sanscrit *sav as* strength *su ra* a hero (from *su* from *śvi* to grow) *su nu s* son' = Sanscrit *su nu s* (सु *su* to bear) In Greek compare *λιγ-νυ-ς* which I have already elsewhere referred to the Sanscrit root *dah* (infin *dag dhum* to burn to which the Latin *lig num* also belongs (see p 1179 G ed) As feminine it answers to the Sanscrit *dhe-nu s* and the Latin *ma nu s* in so far as the latter together with *mu nu s* belongs to the Sanscrit root *md* (see p 1372 G ed Note**) And *θρη-νυ-ς* too in spite of the difference of accent, belongs to this class

919 The suffix *snu* (euphonic *shnu*) given by the Indian grammarians appears to me essentially identical with *nu* and I regard the sibilant *s* as an extension of the root and in some cases *s* as an affix to the vowel of conjunction *i*. Compare the relation of *bhās* to shine *dās* to give *mds* to measure to the more simple more current and in the cognate languages more diffused roots *bhā da ma* and that of *dhuksh dhuksh* to kindle to *dah* to burn. Similar is the relation of the adjectives *glā s-nu s* withering *ju sh nu s* conquering *bhu sh nu s* or *bhav-ish nu s* being. Hereto corresponds the Lithua [G Ed p 1394] *man dus nu s* giving (*du mi* I give)

950 There is a weakened form *mi* of the suffix *ma* discussed in § 805 it forms oxytone appellatives e g *bhu mi s* fem earth *is* being (Latin *hu mu s* cf p 1077) *ur mī s* m f wave * *dal mi s* m Indra's thunderbolt *is* cleaving *ras-mi s* m beam of light

* Either from *ar ri* to go with *u* for *a* (see Unadī IV 45) or from *iar i ri* to cover with the contraction of *va* to *u*

end of compounds, especially in the Vêda dialect, *e g.* *suta-pá-van*, "drinking the Sôma," *vája-dá-van*, "giving food" *b*) Nouns of agency, like *īk-van*, "extoller," *yáj-van*, "sacrificer" *c*) Appellatives, *e g.* *rúh-van*, "tree," as "growing," *sák-van*, "elephant," as "powerful, strong" The Zend furnishes a remarkable word of this class, viz *𐬰𐬀𐬭𐬀 zar-van*, "time," in which I recognise a word radically akin to the Sanscrit *har-i-mán*, which signifies "time," as "carrying away, destroying" (see § 795.). The Greek *χρονο-ς*² is referable, in my opinion, with equal facility, to the Sanscrit root *har*, *hri*, with which, in Greek, obsolete root, *χείρ*, "the hand," as "taking," is also most probably connected. The omission of the radical vowel in *χρόνος*, if we refer the *o* to the suffix, can occasion no doubt, while the suffix *ovo* admits of ready comparison with the Sanscrit-Zend *van* With respect to the necessary dropping of the digamma, compare the relation of the suffix *cvr* to the Sanscrit *vant*, and with reference to the vowel added to the final consonant of the suffix, the relation of the Latin *lentu* (with *lent*) to the same suffix (see §. 20)

948 The Sanscrit suffix *nu* (see § 851) forms oxytone adjectives and substantives, *e g.* *grīdh-nú-s*, "wistful, eager," *tras-nú-s*, "trembling, fearing," *dhīśh-nú-s*, "venturing, bold" (*n*, on account of the preceding *sh*), *bhā-nú-s*, "the sun, as "giving light," *dhé-nú-s*, f "milk-cow," as "giving

[G Ed p 1393] to drink" (root *dhé*, "to drink," with causal signification), *sū-nú-s*, "son," as "born" So, in Zend, *𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬭𐬀 taf-nu-s*, "burning" (see §. 40), *𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬭𐬀 ras-nu-s*, "straightforward, true" |, *𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬭𐬀 barēsh-nu-s*, "high, great," as substantive, "summit"[†], *janf-nu-s*, "mouth," as

² Cf Burnouf, "Études," p 197

[†] Root *𐬭𐬀𐬭𐬀 𐬀𐬭𐬀*=Sanskrit *ry* (from *raj*), whence *ryú*, "direct," see Burnouf, "Yajna," p 195

Bṛi čz=San *viñh*, Vêd *bṛih*, "to grow," see Burnouf, "Études," p 194

speaking (see § 61) in Lithuanian mostly from obsolete roots *drung nu s* (also *drung na s*) lukewarm *gad nu s* fit *mac nu s* powerful (cf *maci s* might Gothic *mah ts* Sanscrit *manh mah* to grow" Latin *mag nus*) *szau nu s* able doughty (cf Sanscrit *sav as* strength *su ru* a hero (from *su* from *śvi* to grow) *su nu s* son = Sanscrit *su nu s* (सू *su* to bear) In Greek compare *λυγ-νυ-ς* which I have already elsewhere referred to the Sanscrit root *dah* (infin *dag dhum* to burn to which the Latin *lig num* also belongs (see p 1179 G ed) As feminine it answers to the Sanscrit *dhê-nu s* and the Latin *ma nu s* in so far as the latter together with *mu nu s* belongs to the Sanscrit root *mā* (see p 1372 G ed Note**) And *θρη-νυ-ς* too in spite of the difference of accent, belongs to this class

949 The suffix *snu* (euphonic *shnu*) given by the Indian grammarians appears to me essentially identical with *nu* and I regard the sibilant as an extension of the root and in some cases as an affix to the vowel of conjunction : Compare the relation of *bhās* to shine *dās* to give *mās* to measure to the more simple more current and in the cognate languages more diffused roots *bhā dā mā* and that of *dhuksh dhuksh* to kindle to *dah* to burn Similar is the relation of the adjectives *glā s nu s* withering *ju sh-nu s* conquering *bhu sh nu s* or *bhav-ish nu s* being Hereto corresponds the Lithua [G Ed p 1394] *man dus nu s* giving (*du-mi* I give)

950 There is a weakened form *mi* of the suffix *ma* discussed in § 805 it forms oxytone appellatives e g *bhu mi s* fem earth as being (Latin *hu mu s* cf p 1077) *ur mī s m f* wave * *dal mī s m* Indra's thunderbolt as cleaving *ras-mi s m* beam of light

* Either from *ar ri* to go with *u* for *a* (see Unadi IV 45) or from *tar ri* to cover with the contraction of *ta* to *u*

bridle”⁴ Under this class of words is to be reckoned the Gothic *hai-m(i)-s*, f. (theme *hai-mi*), “village,” from the obsolete root *hi* with Gura = Sanscrit *śi*, from *hī*, “to lie, to sleep,” the plural, *hai-mós*, belongs to a base *harmó*.†

951 The suffix *ka* (*a-ka*, *â-ka*, *i-ka*, *u-ka*, *û-ka*, see § 939) I regard as identical with the interrogative base *ka*, which, however, as suffix, must be taken in a demonstrative or relative sense, as indeed its representative also in New Persian and Latin has both a relative and interrogative meaning. In direct combination with the root, *ka* is not of frequent occurrence in Sanscrit. The most current word of this kind of formation is *śush-ká-s*, “dry,” the Latin sister form of which *siccus* has probably arisen by assimilation and weakening of the *u* to *i* from *sus-cu-s*. That the *ś* of the Sanscrit root, for which, in Latin, *c* were to be expected, has arisen from the dental *ṣ*, and not from *k*, is proved

[G Ed p 1395] by the Zend *hush-ka*, “dry.” The *χ* *ch* of the Slavonic *сухъ sūch*, “dry,” is based on the Sanscrit *sh* of the root (see § 255 m). The Lithuanian form of this adjective is *sauš-a-s*. With *o-ka*, *â-ka*, *i-ka*, *u-ka*, are formed adjectives, and nouns of agency or appellatives, which accent the root, e.g., *nárt-a-ka-s*, “dancer,” fem *nárt-a-kī*, “female dancer,” *náy-a-ka-s*, “guide” (root *nī* with the Vriddhi), *khán-a-ka*, “digging,” fem *-hâ*, *jálp-â-ka*, “loquacious,” fem *kī* (Am Ko, III 36), *khán-i-ka-s*, “digger,” *músh-i-ka-s*, “mouse,” as “stealing” root *mush*), *kám-u-ka*, “longing,” *ghát-u-ka*, “destroying” (root *han*, “to slay,” causal *ghátáy*) *Ū-ka* forms paroxytone adjectives from frequentatives and *jágar*, *-gr*, “to watch,”

⁴ Akin, in the first signification perhaps, to the roots *arch*, *ruch* (from *ark*, *ruk*, as *raś* from *rak*), “to shine,” or to *las*, “to shine.” There is no root *raś*.

† Regarding the European cognates of the Gothic word, see Glossarium Sanscr., a 1847, p 350

thus only from reduplicated roots which as it appears support their heavy build by a long vowel hence *eg* *vāvad-ā-ha*, loquacious *jāgar u ha* watchful Hereto correspond irrespective of the reduplication in Latin *cad-u-cu-s* and *ma-* *fid u cu s* *Fid u cu s* presupposes a pri-
 mitive *fid ā-cu s* or *fid ū c s* As *u la u cu* is only a
 lengthening of *la ucu* so perhaps the Latin *i cu* of
am i cu s *pud-ē-cu s* is a lengthening of the Sanscrit *i ha*
 while *med i cu s* *rom i cu s* subs *rom i ca* *per i ca* (if it
 comes from *partu*) have preserved the original shortness*
 The bases *vert i c* *vort i c* *pend i c* *append i c* *pōd i c* (from
pēdo) have lost the final vowel of the suffix Under *वृत्*
ā ha is to be ranked the Latin *ā-c* with the final vowel
 suppressed in bases like *ed-ā c* *vor ā c* *fall ā c* *ten ā c*
retin-ā c *sequ ā c* *loqu ā c* (as above *jālp ā ha* loquacious)
 so too *ā-c*—as *ā-* see §§ 3 4—in *cel u c* *vel ō c* (for *vol ō c*)
fer ō-c In Greek *φυλάκω-s* from a lost root (*φυλασσω*
 springs from *φυλάκω-s*) corresponds as exactly [G Ed p 1306]
 as possible to the Sanscrit formations like *nart-a ha s* a
 dancer and *φειλάκω-s* for *φει-ακω-s* (cf *φειάκη*) to such as
jālp-ā ha s, loquacious chatterer and in Latin such as
loqu ā-c The base *κηρ uκ* for *κηρ ūko* likewise from an ob-
 solete root corresponds to the Sanscrit bases in *u ha* and
 Latin in *u-cu* To the above mentioned feminine *nart alī*
 dancer (also *nom*) corresponds in point of formation
 the Greek *γυν-ακω-s* *ακω-s* in which I recognise a transposition of
γυνάκι (see § 11) for which in Sanscrit *janakī* as bear-
 ing children would be to be expected as feminine to the
 actually existing *g jān āka s* father as begetter —The
 Sanscrit formations like *īhan i la s* digger are most
 truly represented in Lithuanian of all the European mem-
 bers of our family languages by nouns of agency like
deg i ha s *ince* *ndriav* (*degu*=Sanskrit *dāh ā mi* I burn)

* See Duntzer, The Doctrine of the Formation of Latin Words p 37

leid-i-kha-s, "wood-floater" (*léid-mi*, "I float wood"),
kul-i-kha-s, "thresher" (*kullù*, "I thresh, pret *kulau*") The
 Gothic places as parallel to the Sanscrit *a-ka*, of *khán-a-ka*,
 "digging," the suffix *a-ga*† in *gréd-a-ga*, n m *gréd-a-g'-s*,
 "hungry," properly, "desiring" (Sanskrit root *grīdh*) from
gradh, "to crave"

952 It is probable that the *n* of the forms in *ng* (theme
nga) which occurs in all the German languages, with the
 exception of Gothic, with a vowel preceding (*i* or *u*), is an
 unessential insertion, just as, according to § 56 ^a, in Zend
 forms like *mananha*, for *manaha* = Sanscrit *manasá* If this
 be the case, we may compare Old High German forms like

[G Ed p 1397.] *kun-ing*, "king" (also *kun-ig*), theme *kun-*
inga, with Sanscrit formations in *a-ka* (*nánt-aka-s*, "dancer,"
 p 1395 G. ed), and Greek in *α-κο-ς*, (*φύλ-α-κο-ς*, l. c.), which
 I prefer to do, rather than regard the *i* as existing even
 from the time of the unity of languages, and I therefore
 compare *i-nga* with the Sanscrit *i-ka*, e g, in *khán-i-ka-s*,
 "digger" (l c) The original meaning of *kun-in-g* was
 probably "man," *κατ' ἐξοχήν*, as the English "queen" is, pro-
 perly, merely "woman" (cf Gothic *quevn(i)-s*, "woman"
 = Sanscrit *जनि-s*, "woman," as "bearing children"),
 and corresponds in root and suffix to the above-mentioned
 (p 1396 G ed) Sanscrit *ján-a-ka-s*, "father," as "begetter"
 Should, too, in the often-mentioned abstract substantives in
unga‡, the guttural be the principal letter, and the last
 syllable, therefore, the most important part of the suffix,
 then *unga*, e g, in *heil-unga*, "healing" (Grimm, II 360),
 must be compared with the Sanscrit feminines in *a-ká*, e g,

^a The doubling of the consonants very commonly serves in Lithuanian
 only to mark the shortness of the preceding vowel, see Kurschat, "Con-
 tributions," II p 32

† Regarding the medial for the original tenuis, cf § 91 p 80

‡ See § 803 and p 1275 G ed

in *khan a-la* the digging and we must assume that this feminine adjective form has raised itself in the German languages to an abstract as *e g* in Greek, *κακη* comes from the adjective *κακο* & *κακη* and in Latin forms like *fractura ruptura* are evidently nothing but the feminines of the future participle. In English as is also frequently the case so early as the Anglo Saxon *ing* represents our *ung* as a formative of abstract substantives and since adjectives are formed in *ing* this termination has in New English utterly and entirely dislodged the old participle in *end* while in Middle English the forms in *end* and *ing* still co exist (Grimm I p 1038). I therefore am not of opinion that as Grimm in the second part of his Grammar (p 356) assumes the New English participles are [G I d p 1398] corruptions from *end* as *e* does not readily become *i* whence it has often itself been by a corruption derived.

953 As a secondary suffix *ka* (*i ka u ka*) forms in Sanscrit words of multifarious relations to their primary word. To forms like *mudra ka s* *sindhu ka s* native of the land Madra Sindhu *bāla ka s* boy from *bāla* of equivalent meaning *sita ka s* cold weather the cold season of the year a slothful man from *sita* cold correspond as regards formation the Gothic adjective bases *staina ha* stony *vaurda ha* literal *un barna ha* childless *un hunsla ga* without offering not distributing (*hunsle s* theme *hunsle* offering) *aina han* sole (the latter with inorganic *n*)* and with *g* for *h* (see § 951 conclusion) *moda ga* ireful *auda ga* happy (*aud* theme *auda* treasure) *handu ga* dextrous skilful clever in the nominative masculine *handu g(a) s*. The last example answers well to the above mentioned Sanscrit *sindhu la s* and it might therefore be expected that also from the

* So the substantive base occurring only in the plural *brothra han* (transposed from *brothar han*) nom *brothra han s* brother

bases *grêdu*, "hunger," *vullthu*, "splendour," not *grêda-g'-s*, "hungry," *vultha-g'-s*, "famed," would come, but only *grêdu-g'-s*, *vullthu-g'-s*. Perhaps, however, the preponderating number of the adjective bases in *a-ga*, nom. m. *a-gs*, which come from substantive bases in *a*, has had an influence on the formation of the adjectives derived from *grêdu*, *vullthu*, and given them, by an abuse, *a* for *u*, or the said adjectives come from lost substantive bases *grêda*, *vultha* (cf § 914), which, perhaps, for the first time after the production of the adjectives referred to, have been weakened to *grêdu*, *vullthu*, just as the Sanscrit bases *pâda*, "foot," *danta*, "tooth,"

[G Ed p 1399] have become, in Gothic, *fôtu*, *tunthu*. The Gothic substantive bases in *i* lengthen their final vowel before the suffix *ga* to *ei*, hence, *e g*, *anstei-ga*, "favourable," *mahtei-ga*, "powerful," *lstei-ga*, "subtle," from the feminine primitive bases *ansti*, "grace," *mahti*, "might," *lsti*, "subtily." Feminine bases in *ein*, nom *ei*, produce, in like manner, derivatives in *ei-ga*; as, *e g*, *gabei-ga*, from *gabein*, n *gabei*, "riches," and so, too, the neuter base *gavairthya*, "peace" (nom *gavairthi*), whence *gavairthei-ga*, "pacific." As several abstract feminine bases in *ein* come from adjective bases in *a* (see p 1306 G ed), so, perhaps, from *sina*, nom *sin(a)-s*, "old," may have come an abstract *sinein*, "age," and hence *sinei-ga*, "old," *i e* "having age," and for *thuwei-ga*, "good," I presuppose a feminine base *thuwein*, "goodness" (from *thuuda*, n, nom *thuuth*, "good"). Of verbal origin is *lais-ei-ga*, "teaching" (from *lais-ya*, "I teach," pret *lais-ei-da*), and so, *andanêm-ei-ga*, "accepting," may have sprung, not from the above-mentioned (§ 914) base *andanêma*, "acceptance," but from a to-be-presupposed weak verb *anda-nêmya*. In New High German the *i* of words like *sternig*, "starry," *gunstig*, "favourable," *kraftig*, "powerful," *machtig*, "mighty," has won for itself the appearance of an important portion of the suffix, the more, as it has kept its place without reference to the primary

in *-σκο*, *-σκη* (*παιδ-ί-σκο-ς*, *παιδ-ί-σκη*, *στρεφαν-ί-σκο-ς*), is only a phonetic prefix. In support of this view we may refer to the euphonic *s*, which, in Sanscrit, is inserted between some roots beginning with *h* and certain prepositions, *e g.*, in *parishkar*, *-hri*, "to adorn," properly, "to put around." Compare, also, the Latin *s* in combinations like *abscondo*, *abspello*, *abstineo*, *ostendo* (for *obstendo*)

[G Ed p 1401] 955. In Latin I regard the *i* of words like *belli-cu-s*, *cæli-cu-s*, *domini-cu-s*, *uni-cu-s*, *auli-cu-s*, as a weakening of the final vowel of the base word, like the *i* before the suffixes *tât* and *tûdin* and at the beginning of compounds. I compare here the said word with the Sanscrit like *mâdra-ha-s*, *bâlâ-ha-s*, *sîndhu-ha-s*, and Gothic like *staina-h(a)-s*, *mûda-g(a)-s*, *handu g(a)-s*. In words like *cui-cu-s*, *classi-cu-s*, *hosti-cu-s*, the *i* demonstrates itself to belong to the primitive base, while the *i*, which is appended to bases terminating in a consonant, *e g.*, in *ubi-cu-s*, *patri-cu-s*, *pedi-ca*, and that, too, in the Latin ablative plural (*pedi-bus*=Sanskrit *pad-bhryâs*), and in compounds like *pedi-sequus*, have been first introduced in Latin to facilitate the combination with the following consonant, on which account I am unwilling to place such words, with respect to the *i* before their suffix, on the same footing with Sanscrit words like *hâmant'-i-kâ-s*, "wintry, cold," from *hê-mantâ*, "winter," *dhârm'-i-kâ-s*, "virtuous, devoted to duty," from *dhârma*, "duty, right," *âksh-i-lâ-s*, "dice-player," from *akshâ*, "dice." To these, however, correspond, with respect to accentuation also, Greek derivatives like *πολεμ'-i-κό-ς*, *ἁδελφ'-i-κό-ς*, *ἀμπκλ'-i-κό-ς*, *ὠρ'-i-κό-ς*, *ἄστ'-i-κό-ς*, *ῥηγορ-i-κό-ς*, *δαίμον-i-κό-ς*, *ἄρωματ-i-κό-ς*, *γεροντ-i-κό-ς*. To Sanscrit forms in which the suffix is appended without the intervention of any vowel, as above *sîndhu-ha-s*, corresponds, irrespective of the accentuation, *ἄστυ-κό-ς*. Re-

* See my "Smaller Sanscrit Grammar," 2d Edition, p 62

garding the Greek formations in $\tau\iota\ \kappa\omicron\varsigma$ from to be presupposed abstract bases in $\tau\iota$, see p 1198 G ed Note

956 The Sanscrit suffix *tu* with its cognates in the European sister languages has already been considered as a formative of the infinitive* The cor [G Ed p 1402] responding Gothic abstracts like the Latin (§ 865) have exchanged the feminine gender with the masculine and preserved the original tenuis under the guard of a preceding *s* or *h* but after other letters changed it to *d* or *th* (cf § 91) The suffix is either added direct to the verbal root or to the theme of a weak verb terminating in *ō* or to an adjective base in *a* lengthening this vowel to *ō* (see § 69) To this class belong *vahs tu s* growth *lus tu s* proof *lus tu s* desire † *thuh tu s* prejudice *vratō du s* journey *auhyō du s* noise *mannishō du s* humanity (from *mannisla* nom *mannish s* human) *gabauryō du s* desire pleasure (cf *gabaurya ba* adverb willingly voluntarily) *Dau thu s* death properly the dying is radically connected with the Greek $\theta\alpha\iota\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$ and the Sanscrit *han* from *dhan* to slay (*ni dhana* death) and has vocalised the *n* of the obsolete root to *u* (cf § 432) In Sanscrit *a thu* the *th* of which I regard as a mutation of *t* forms some masculine abstracts from verbal roots ~ *e g* *ram a thu s* *vomitus* *vēp a thu s* the trembling *nand a thús* joy *svay a thu s* the tumefying (*svi* to grow)

957 With the suffix *tu* in Sanscrit are formed also nouns of agency and appellatives some of which accent the root and some the suffix *e g* *gan tu s* traveller (*gam* to go) *tan tu s* thread (*tan* to stretch) *bhā tu s* sun (*bhā* to shine) *yā tu s* traveller (*yā* to go)

* See §§ 852 853 862 863, 865 866, 868

† Probably from *lus* (= Greek $\lambda\iota$ Sanscrit *li*) so that it properly signifies loosening or letting go

[G Ed p 1403] *jan-tú-s*, "animal," as "producing," or "produced." So in Gothic, *hlif-tu-s*, "thief," as "stealing" (cf κλέπ-τω), *shil-du-s*, "shield," as "covering" in Greek, μάρπ-τυς in Hesychy, if the form is genuine, and μάρ-τύς, which Pott, as it appears to me rightly, traces back to the Sanscrit root *smri* (i.e. *smar*), "to recall," to which the Latin *memor*, and Old High German *máriu*, also belong. | With the above-mentioned (§ 933, Note †) Vêdic *jív-â-tu-s*, m. "life," might be compared, as regards the inserted â, the abstracts from nominal bases in Latin like *princip-â-tu-s*, *consul-â-tu-s*, *patrion'-â-tu-s*, *triumvir'-â-tu-s*, *tribun'-â-tu-s*, *sen'-â-tu-s*. These, however, are, as it were, only imitations of the abstracts, which spring from verbs of the first conjugation†, as also *sen-â-tor* answers to nouns of agency like *am-â-tor*, and *jan'-i-tor* (from *janua*, with the suppression of the two final vowels), *ol'-i-tor* (for *oler-i-tor*, just like *opifex* for *oper-i-fer*), to those like *mon-i-tor*. So in Greek, ἀκρω-τήρ from ἀκρο, and as τη-ς and τηρ are originally one (see § 810.), numerous denominative formations in τη-ς, like δημό-τη-ς, ἱππό τη-ς, πολί-τη-ς, κωμή-τη-ς, Σιβαρῖ-τη-ς, Πισᾶ-τη-ς, Αἰγινή-τη-ς. I believe, too, that I may refer to this class patronymics in ι-δη-ς or δη-ς, as Κεκροπ-ί-δη-ς, Μεινον-ί-δη-ς, Κρον-ί-δη-ς, Ἰπποτά-δη-ς, Βορρά-δη-ς, as I assume a change of the tenuis to the medial, as in the Latin forms like *tim-i-du-s* (see §. 822) It may here be observed, that the Greek patronymics in ι-ων (theme ι-ων or ι-ον), too, stand, in respect to their

[G Ed p 1404] suffix, if we regard ων, ον, as the important part of it, combined with a class of words, which is originally destined for the formation of nouns of agency (see § 926), which is also the case with the feminine pa-

* Cf *skal-ya*, "tegula," and the Sanscrit root *chhad* (see § 14), "to cover," *l* therefore from *d* (see § 17)

† See Glossarium Sanser, a 1847, p 392

‡ Cf Pott, II p 554

tronyms in *io*, since the corresponding Sanskrit *i* as feminine of *a* forms both feminine nouns of agency and appellatives with the fundamental meaning of a participle present (e.g. *nadī* river as purling from *nada* id) and feminine patronymics like *bhāimī** (see § 970)

958 Some few suffixes still remain to be discussed which occur only in the secondary formation of words among them is the Sanskrit *eya* fem *ēyā* which is used for a purpose similar to that of *ya* according to § 901. In its origin too *ēya* appears identical with *ya* and to be only a phonetic extension of the latter. The accent in formations in *ēya* rests either on the final syllable of the suffix, or on the first syllable of the entire word e.g. *dtr eya s* descendant of Atri *dās ēya s* son of a slave from *dāsa* *gāt ēya-m* bitumen from *gati* a mountain *vrāh ēya m* rice field from *vrīhi* rice *māh-ēyā s* earthen from *mahi* *pāturush ēya s* referring to men consisting of men from *purusha* *dh ēya s* anguinus from *ahi* *anguis grāv ēya m* belonging to the neck from *grīvā* throat neck. To the three last examples correspond also in throwing back the accent as far as possible Greek words like *λεοντ ειο s* *λεοντ εο s* *αιγ ειο-s* *τρα ειο s* *σιδηρ ειο-s* *αργυρ ειο-s*. To this class belong in Latin words like *pic eu s* *ciner eu s* *flor eu s* *aer eu s* *argent eu s* *aur eu s* *ign eu s* (cf. Pott *Etym Inq* II 502). In these formations therefore and in the Greek in *εο s* the Sanskrit diphthong of *ē* which is contracted from *ai* has left behind only its first element in the shape of *e* *e* (as in *κατερος s* = *katara s* see § 293) on the other hand [G. Ed. p. 1405] in *pleb ēju s* the Sanskrit suffix *ēya* (*y*=Latin *j*) has been retained with the utmost exactness and so too in some proper names as *Pomp ēju s* *Petr ēju s* *Luci ēju s* (see Dantzei *Doctrine of the Formation of Latin Words* p. 33).

959 The secondary suffixes *ant* *mant* in the strong cases *ant* *mant* which form possessive adjectives from substan



tives, are perhaps simply phonetic extensions of the primary suffixes *van* and *man* (cf §. 803), and, on the other hand, *vin* and *min*, e.g., in *tējas-vin*, "gifted with light," *mēdhā-vin*, "intelligent," *svā-mín'*, "lord, owner" ("gifted with his own (*sva*")), have been formed by weakening the vowel from *van* and *man*. It is most probable, too, that *vant* and *mant*, as also *van* and *man*, are originally one, as **v* and *m* are easily interchanged. A comparison has already been drawn between *vant* | and the Latin *lent*, extended to *lentu*. In Greek the suffix *εντ* (from *Feντ*) corresponds, which, as is usually done by its Sanscrit sister-form *vant*, allows the accent to fall on the syllable which immediately precedes, hence, e.g., *δολό εντ*, *ἀμπελό-εντ*, *ὕλη-εντ*, *τολή-εντ*, *πυρ-ό-εντ*, *μελιτ-ό-εντ*, *δακρυ-ό-εντ*, *μητι-ό-εντ*, as in Sanscrit, e.g., *dhaná-vant*, "rich," from *dhána*, "riches," *mēdhā-vant*, "intelligent," from *mēdhā*, "understanding," *lakshmī-vant*, "fortunate," from *lakshmī*, "fortune."

960 The suffix *तना*, *f taná*, forms adjectives from adverbs of time. They accent optionally the first syllable of the suffix or the syllable preceding, e.g., *hyas-tána-s* or *hyás-tana-s*, "hesternus," from *hyas*, "yesterday," *śvas-tána-s* or *śvás-tana-s*, [G Ed p 1406] "crastinus," from *śvas*, "to-morrow," *sāyan-tána-s* or *sāyán-tana-s*, "vespertinus," from *sāyam*, "at evening" (properly an accusative), *saná-tána-s* or *saná-tana-s*, "sempiternus," from *saná*, "always." In Latin corresponds, as needs hardly be mentioned, *tinu* in *cras-tinu-s*, *diu-tinu-s* (cf *divá-tana-s*, "daily," (P) from *divá*, "in the day"), *pris-tinu-s*, lengthened to *tínu* in *vesper-tínu-s*, *matu-tínu-s* †

* The Indian Grammarians refer the *á*, which I regard as the lengthening of the *a* of the primitive base, to the suffix

† See § 20, and "Influence of the Pronouns on the formation of Words," p 7

‡ *Mátú* (an adverbial ablative like *noctú*), which is to be presupposed as base word, is perhaps connected with the Sanscrit *bhātu*, "sun," so that

The forms *heslernus sempiternus æternus* have either prefixed an inorganic *r* to the *n* or they presuppose *hesler sempiter æter* (*ætiler*) as primitives (cf § 293) so that only *nu* would be the derivative suffix. The former view is favoured by the forms *hodiernus nocturnus* and some others which have probably first appended the suffix *nu* and then further prefixed an *r* to the *n* (cf *alburnus* from *albus* *lucerna* from *luceo*).

961 As regards the origin of the suffix *tana* I look upon it as a combination of the pronominal bases *ta* and *na* a combination which occurs in Old Prussian in the independent pronoun *tan s* (from *tana s*) he *sein tennd* (for *ta na*) she. So the suffix *tya* which forms proxytone adjectives from indeclinables as *ihá tyá s* a man of this place *tatrá tyá s* a man of that place is probably identical with the compound demonstrative base *tya* (see § 353) and therefore in the said examples denotes the person who is here (*ihá*) there (*tatrá*). So too as has already been remarked (§ 400) in Greek εἰθα-σιος (in Hesych) comes from εἴθα (thus -σιος from τιος) and in Latin *propitius* from *prope* and in [G Ed p 1407] Gothic the base *framathya* (nom m *framathes ahenus* strange) from the preposition *fram* from whether it be that *frama* is the original form of the preposition or that the *a* of the derivative is a vowel of conjunction. The base *ni thya* nom *nithyi s* cousin as *propinquus* I derive from the same preposition *ni* (among) whence in Sanscrit *ni kátá s* *propinquus* *ni tyá s* *sempiternus*. Another Sanscrit word of this class which has sprung from a preposition is *amát tyá s* counsel properly *conjunctus* from *amát* with. I also refer here *ápá tyá m* offspring child in spite of its different accentuation (see Nugh

that the labial mute of the root *bha* to shine passes over into the nasal of its organ as is also probably the case in *mane*

II 2, and Benfey's Gloss to the S V), as I derive it, as I formerly did, from the preposition *upa*

962 The demonstrative base *sya*, fem *syā* (see § 353), which is limited in classical Sanscrit to the nominative singular, with which, most probably, the genitive termination *sya* is connected (see §. 191), has, in the secondary formation of words, likewise its presumptive equivalent, viz in the now but seldom found *sya* (euphonic *shya*), through which *manu-shyā-s*, "man," is formed from *manú*, "Manu," and *dhēnu-shyā*, "a cow tied up (to be milked)," comes from *dhēnú*.^{*} If words of this kind have originally been numerous, we might then refer to this class the Latin *riu*, which is always preceded by an *ā*, and assume the favourite transition of *s* into *r*, thus, e g, *tabell'-ā-riu-s*, *palm'-ā-riu-s*, *arbor-ā-riu-s*, *ær-ā-riu-s*, *ign'-ā-riu-s*, *actu-ā-riu-s*, *contr'-ā-riu-s*, *advers'-ā-riu-s*, *prim'-ā-riu-s*, *secund'-ā-riu-s*, from *tabell'-ā-siu-s*, &c But if the *r* of these forms is primitive, *riu* might be regarded as an extension of the suffix *ri* = Sanscrit *रि ri* (see § 943), as together with *palm'-ā-riu-s* there actually exists a form

[G Ed p 1408] *palm'-ā-ri-s*. The *ā* can in neither case be referred to the proper suffix, but is to be regarded as that of forms like *princip-ā-tu-s*, *sen-ā-tu-s*, *sen-ā-ton* (see p 1403 G ed)

963 The Latin *ā-riu* guides us to the Gothic suffix *arja*, to which, however, I can concede no affinity to the former, whether it be that the Latin *r* is primitive, or has arisen from *s*. The Gothic is unacquainted with any interchange between the *s* and *r*, and we must therefore allow the *r* of the said suffix to pass as original. It forms nouns of agency, and, in the secondary formation, words which denote the person who is occupied with the matter denoted by the base word. To this class belong the mas-

* The Indian Grammarians form both these words with the suffix *ya* with *sh* prefixed

culine bases *lais arya* teacher (*lais ya* I teach), *sok arya* examiner (*sok ya* I seek) *luuth arya* singer (*luuth* I sing) *bok arya* scribe (*bol a* theme *bôkô* letter pl *bokos* writings) *mol arya* toll gatherer (*môta* toll custom) *vull arya* fuller (*vulla* wool) The nominatives are *lais areis sôk areis* &c (see § 135) A neuter is *vagg arya* nom *vagg ari* pillow for the head (Old High German *wanga* cheek) It is perhaps by an accident that the sources of Gothic literature which remain to us supply no nouns of agency from roots of strong verbs these however are not wanting in the other Germanic dialects The following are examples in Old High German of which I annex the nominatives *scrib eri scriba* bet eri adorator *halt âri* servator, *helf âre* adjutor, *aba nem âri* susceptor, *sez ari* conditor, *troum sceid ari* *interpres somnu* interpreter of dreams The following are examples derived from nouns *gart eri hortulanus*, *hunt eri* centurio, *muniz eri* monetarius *havan ari* *figulus* (potter) *satal ari* ephippiarius (saddler) *uagin-ari* *rhedarius* (cartwright) *vran honô vurt ari* *Francofurtensis* * In [G Ed p 1409] New High German this class of words is very numerously represented by nouns of agency as *Geber* giver *Seher* seer *Denker* thinker *Binder* binder *Springer* springer *Laufner* runner *Trinker* drinker *Schneider* cutter *Streiter* striver *Bäcker* baker **Funger* seizer *Weber* weaver *Forscher* prover *Sucher* seeker *Dreher* turner *Brauer* brewer and denominatives like *Gärtner* gardener *Schreiner* joiner *Topfer* potter *Ziegler* tiler *Wagler* cartwright *Frankfurter* inhabitant of Frankfort *Main-er* inhabitant of Mainz *Berliner* inhabitant of Berlin The

* Regarding the difference of the vowel before the *r* and especially as to this class of words see Grimm II p 100

following are examples in English . " giver, singer, killer, bringer, seller, brewer , glover, gardener, wagoner " Perhaps the Gothic *arya* is on one side an extension, and on the other a mutilation of the Sanscrit suffix *târ*, *ti* (see § 810), an extension by adding the suffix *ya*, as above', in *bê-us-yôs*, " parents," as " bearing children," we have seen the Sanscrit suffix *ush* (from *vas*) in combination with *ya*, and a mutilation by dropping a *t*-sound (*t*, *th*, or *d*, see §. 9.), thus, *e g*, *laisarya*, " teacher," from *laistarya*, just as, in French, the *t* of the Latin *frater*, *pater*, *mater*, has disappeared in the forms *frère*, *père*, *mère*, and that of the suffix *tor* in the nouns of agency in *eur*, in forms like *sauv-eur* (= *salvator*), *port-eur*, *vend-eur* (= *venditor*). If the form was once *arya*, and obtained from *târ*, which corresponds to it in the different German dialects, it might then easily have extended itself as well over roots as nominal bases, to which the perfect form with the initial *t*-sound had never been appended A form like *Geb-ter* or *Gebder*, for *Geber*, " giver," could never have existed , perhaps, however, in Gothic, a base *gif-tarya* may have existed, the *f* of which for *b*, after dropping the *t*, became again *b* (as in [G Ed p 1410] the pret pl, *e g*, *gêbum* compared with the sing *gaf*, *gaf-t*), therefore *gibarya*, to which our *Geber* would correspond

COMPOUNDS

964 In the Indo-European languages the verbs are compounded with scarce aught but prepositions, which in Sanscrit are always accented, and some of which, except in the Vêda dialect, never occur in the uncompounded state I annex some Sanscrit verbs compounded with

prepositions in the 3d person of the present *adhi-gach chhati* he goes thither, *antār gachchhati* he goes under, *āpa kramati* he goes off *abhi gachchhati* he goes towards he approaches *āśa skandati* he descends, *parā-varṭatē* he returns, *pāri gachchhati* he goes round, *pra dravati* 'he runs away' *prāti kramati* he gives way *prāti bhāṣhatē* he answers he speaks against *prāti-padyatē* he arrives *nish kramati* he comes forth, *san gachchhati* (euphon for *sam*) he comes together Compare without reference to the verbal root in Greek ἀποβαίνει ἀμφιβαίνει περιβαίνει προβαίνει προσβαίνει (προς from ποτι see § 152 p 167) συμβαίνει in Latin *adit interit abut ambit obit procedit concreditur* in Old High German *umbi cāt umbe-gāt* he goes round *untar gāt* he goes under in Gothic *at gaggith* 'he goes to' *af-gaggith* he goes away *bi qvimuth* he overtakes (*qvimuth* he comes) *bi gairdith* he girds, *fra l'ilh* he abandons in Lithuanian *isz-eiti* he goes out (*isz*=*ἵσθης*) *par eiti* he goes back *par-nes-a* he brings back *pra nesza* he represents *priesz tarauja* he contradicts *su mais o* he mingles in Old Sclavonic (see Dobrowsky p 401) *oręzazati obriežati* περιτεμειν *circumcidere*, *ngalutu pro liti* *profundere*, *ngūnā pri-idun adveniam* *ngūnā pri imun accipio*, *ngūbeae pri vede adduxit*, *ngūnestu* [G Ed p 1411] *pri neste asferre*, *ngūstauutu pri stup i li accidere*, *ngūnūbatu pri shiv a u assuere*, *ngūstaturu s ristati san concurrere*

965 In the Veda dialect the prepositions are frequently found separated by intermediate words from the verb to which they belong notwithstanding this with respect to sense there continues the most intimate connection between the preposition and the verb, e g *sām agnīm indhatē nārah ignem accendunt viri* (see Rasens Specimen p 20) Here *sam* taken alone has no meaning at all but

in combination with the root *indh* it signifies "to kindle," which *indh* also means by itself. In Zend, too, such separations of the prepositions from the verbs often occur, and in German many old combinations are so altered, that, in the proper verb (not in the infinitive and the participles, and especially not in the formation of words), we place the preposition that had been prefixed either directly after the verb, or separate it still farther from it by several intermediate words. We say, e.g., *ausgehen*, *ausgehend*, *Ausgang*, "to go out," "going out," "egress," but not *er ausgeht*, "he goes out," as in Gothic *usgaggith*, but *er geht aus*, "he goes out," *er geht von diesem Gesichtspunkte aus*, "he goes from this point of view out," while, however, after the relative and most of the conjunctions we prefix the prepositions, since we say, e.g., *welcher ausgeht*, "who goes out," *wenn er ausgeht*, "if he goes out," *dass er ausgeht*, "that he goes out." Moreover, in prepositions, whose meaning is no more clearly perceived, and also in those to which there are no correlative prepositions with an opposite meaning, as in *ein*, "in," opposed to *aus*, "out," *vor*, "before," opposed to *nach*, "after," *an*,

[G Ed p 1412] "on," opposed to *ab*, "off," or where the verbal motion has a decided preponderance over the prepositional, or where the significations of the preposition and the verb have blended completely together, the separation of the preposition from the verbal root is not allowed, hence, e.g., *er begreift*, *beweist*, *vergeht*, *verbleibt*, *zerstört*, *zerspringt*, *umgeht*, *umringt*, *übersetzt*, *überspringt*, "he understands, proves, vanishes, remains, destroys, shatters, goes round, surrounds, translates, crosses." The phenomenon under discussion may be so regarded, as that only those prepositions which are accented, and whose signification

* For examples see § 518, where the translation of *frā humanha* is to be corrected according to p 960

is clearly retained have the power of separating themselves from the verbs to which they belong while in Vedic Sanskrit and Zend those prepositions too the meaning of which has quite disappeared in the verbal notion may be detached from the verb

966 In Sanskrit there are but very few* verbs which enter into combinations other than prepositional and even of these only the gerund in *ya* and passive participle in *ta* for the most part appear in multifarious combinations, e.g. *kundali kṛta* made into a ring *ēki bhūta* become one which forms need not be regarded as derivatives from compound verbs like *lundi karōmi ēki bhavāmi* but it is probable that here the participles *kṛta* and *bhūta* have as already independent words united with the first members of the compounds. In Greek as is well known the verbs which are compounded with other elements than prepositions are with very few exceptions not primitive combinations of the particular verb with the preceding word but derivatives from compound nouns as e.g. *τοκογλυφῶ* from *τοκογλυφός* (see Buttmann § 121 3). The same is the case with Old High German [G Ed p 1413] compounds as *hant slagō plaudō* from *hanta slag* clapping the hands *rāt slagi consulo* from *rāt slig* advice and in the New High German as *ich uettersere* I vie *ich hofmeistere* I criticise *ich brandschatze* I put under contribution (see Grimm II p 593). In Gothic e.g. *wei vōdya* I testify comes from *reit vōd's* witness and *filuaurdya* properly I am loquacious either from the substantive base *filuaurdein* nom. -ei loquacity or with this latter word from *ī* to be presupposed adjective base *filuaurda* loquacious. The Latin on the other hand produces verbal compounds by direct combination of a

* See shorter Critical Grammar of the Sanskrit Language 2d Edition § 58.

substantive, adjective, or adverb with a verb, *e g*, *significo*, *ædi-fico*, *anim'-adverto*, *nun-cupo* (cf. *oc-cupo*, and see § 490), *tali-pedo*, *magni-fico*, *æqui-paro*, *bene-dico*, *male-dico*. In Greek, from the participle *δακρυχέων* we may infer a lost verb *δακρυχέω*, and from the adverb *νουνυχόντως* the participle *νουνέχων*, and hence a verb *νουνέχω*. With respect to the accusative *νουν*, we may compare *νουνυχόντως* with the above-mentioned (§ 916) Sanscrit compounds like *arin-damá-s*, "subduing-foes," and the Zend *dhuyǵēm-vanō*, "Druj-slaying" (§. 922). On the other hand, we need not, with Buttmann (§ 121, Rem. 1), regard *δακρυ* in *δακρυχέων* as an accusative, as in this word the accusative (and nominative) is not distinguishable from the theme. Compare Sanscrit compounds like *madhu-līh*, "bee," as "licking honey."

967 When Buttmann (§ 120 c), in Greek, assumes compounds, of which the first part must be a verb, which most usually terminates in *σι*, the *ι* of which, however, as vowel of conjunction, may also be elided, I am unable to agree with him in this. Should, however, in such compounds as *δεισιδαίμων*, *ἐγερσίχορος*, *τρειψίχρως*, *δαμασίβροτος*, *φυξάνως*, *παισάνεμος*,

[G Ed p 1414] *ρήσασπισ*, *πλήξιππος*, a verb be contained, we should have to define to what part of the verb, to what tense, to what number, and what person, these forms in *σι* or *σ'* belong. Having previously determined them to be verbs, I should explain them as obsolete presents in the third person singular, according to the analogy of the conjugation in *μι*, since *σι* or *τι*, as termination of the third person, originally belongs to all active present forms (see § 456), thus, *δεισιδαίμων* would properly signify "he fears the gods," and stands on the same footing with the French compounds like *tire-botte*, *tne-bouchon*, *porte-mouchettes*, *porte-manteau*, *porte-feuille*. I would rather, however, with Pott (E I, p. 90), recognise in the first part of *ἐρυσίχθων* and similar compounds abstract substantive bases in *σι* (from *τι*, see § 845),

the *i* of which is suppressed before vowels* and which had perhaps originally a far wider diffusion than in the received condition of the language. It is therefore not necessary that the abstract of each of the compounds of that kind be retained in use as a simple word or that the abstract which occurs in the compounds should in all cases answer exactly to that which is preserved in use in the simple state. I see no difficulty in the circumstances to which *e.g.* G Curtius (*De nominum Gr form* p 18) has drawn attention that the first part of *στησι-χορος* does not answer to *στασις* nor that of *προδωσ-ταιρος* to *προδοσις*. The radical vowel of *διδωμι* *ἴστημι*, which is shortened before the heavy personal terminations (see § 460) and most of the formative abstracts is naturally long (cf Sanscrit *dā* to give " *sthā* to stand) and from the roots *δω*, *στη* from *στα* the forms *δω-σις* *στη-σις*, or *στα-σις* might be expected as abstracts. The original length of the vowel may [G Ed p 1416] then have been retained in the compounds under discussion or carried back in order to give more emphasis to this class of compounds as above (p 1337 Note † G ed) we have seen a lengthening accrue to the vowel of the last member of another kind of compounds which does not prevent us from recognising *e.g.* in *ανηκουστος* the simple *ακουστος*. I recall attention too to the lengthening which the radical vowel of some abstracts in *σι* experiences in roots terminating in a vowel before the suffix *ιο* (= Sanscrit *ya* see § 901) *e.g.* in *στησι-ιος* (contrasted with *επιστας-ιος*) *λυσι-ιος* and *λυσι-ποιος* *λυσι-ποθος*, &c compared with *λυσις* (Sanskrit root *lā* to cut off). If then in the first part of the compounds referred to we recognise abstract bases in *σι* the whole must then be referred to the class of the

* In *φερ σβιος* *φερεσα κης* also before a consonant. The to be-
supposed abstract *φ ρ ε σις* answers to forms like *γ σις* *ν μ ε σις*
(see § 800 conclusion)

tive appears likewise in the form *αρχε*. The prefixed adjectives make choice in the root too of the lighter vowel hence *φερε* in opposition to *φορο* *e g*, *φερεσταφυλος* opposed to *σταφυλοφορος*. The *i* too of *τερπι* and *αρχι* in *τερπι κερανος* *αρχι κερανιος*, *αρχι θαλασπος*, *αρχι ζωος* &c cannot perhaps be regarded as aught else than the weakening of an *o*=Sanskrit *a* Latin *u* of the second declension and therefore must rest on the same principle on which in Latin *e g* the relation of *cæli cola* to *cælu cola* or *cælo-cola* is based as might be expected if the Latin did not love the most extreme weakening of the final vowel in the first member of compounds (see Vocalismus p 132)

969 While the Latin in its nominal compounds regularly changes the final vowel of the base of the first member of the compound into the lightest [G Rd p 1417] vowel *i** the Sanskrit exclusive of a few anomalies exhibits the first member of the compound (which however is also the second may itself too be compounded) universally in its true theme only that its final letter is subject to the euphonic laws which without the compounding too obtain with respect to the initial and final consonants of two contiguous words I annex a few examples of dependent compounds of a class to be more closely examined hereafter *lōka pālu s* world

* Hence *e g* *cæli-cola* for *cælu cola* or *cælō cola* *laniger* for *lanager* *fructifer* for *fructu fer* *manipulus* for *manu pulus* cf § 6 and §§ 214 879 In *albō galerus* *albō gihus* *merō libus* the final vowel of the base has been retained in the form which lies at the base of the dative and ablative singular and genitive and accusative plural while *locu ples* lengthened *locu ples* is based on the form which has assumed the original *a* in the nominative and accusative singular Before vowels the final vowel of the first member is suppressed hence *e g* *un animus* *fix animus* occasionally also before consonants for example in *navi fragus* for *navi fragus au* *spex* for *avi spex* *vin demia* for *vin demia* or *vin demia* *puer pera* for *pueri pera* or *puer* *pera* *mal luvia* (with assimilation) *sir mani luvie* from *manu luvie*

protector ;" *dhará-dhará-s*, "earth-bearer," *mati-bhramá-s*, "error of the mind," *vīrinī-tīá-s*, "shore of Vīrinī;" *madhu-pá-s*, "bee," as "honey-drinker," *bhū-dhará-s*, "earth-bearer" ("mountain"), *pīti-bhātá*, "father's brother" (see §. 214); *gō-dhūk* (theme *gō-dūh*), "cowherd," literally, "milk-ing-cows," *nāu-sthá-s*, "standing, being in a ship" (*Diluv Śl* 32), *marud-ganá-s*, "troop of winds" (euphonic for *marut-*), *rāja-putrá-s**, "king's son;" *nabhas-talá-m*, "atmosphere."

[G. Ed p 1418] 969 The Sanscrit does not use a vowel of conjunction to lighten the two members of the compound, and it must be regarded as a consequence of the effeminacy which has in this respect entered into Greek and Latin, that these two languages, in the composition of nouns, with the exception of some isolated cases, do not understand how to combine a consonantal termination with an initial consonant, but insert a vowel of conjunction, *oi*, which is the same thing, extend the first member with a vowel affix, for which purpose the Greek regularly makes choice of *o*, occasionally of *i*, while the Latin invariably chooses the weakest vowel *i*. The *σ* alone, in Greek, has left itself pretty often free from the inorganic affix, hence, *e g*, *σακεσ-φόρος* (see § 128), *τελεσ-φόρος*, *σακέσ-παλος*, *ὄρσ-κῶς*, *ἐπσ-βόλος*, *μυσ-κέλενδρον*†, *φωσ-φόρος* (for *φωτ-φόρος*, cf § 152). And *ν*, too, in the bases *μελαν* and *παντ*, the

* For *ῥαγαν-*, *n* is dropped at the beginning of compounds (see § 139)

† That the *σ* in this compound is not a euphonic affix, but belongs to the base, and that hence, in the genitive, *μυός* stands for *μυσός*, *ns, e g*, *μένεος* for *μένεσος*, is plain, as well from the Latin *mus*, *mīu-is*, from *mūr-is*, as from the etymology of the Sanscrit *mūsh-á-s*, "mouse," from *mūsh*, "to steal," see Glossar Sci., a 1847, p 268. In Latin the compounds *mus-cipula* and *mus-cerda* are deserving notice, as they have in like manner retained the original *s* without the addition of a vowel of conjunction. I must dissent from Buttmann (§ 120 Rem 11), as I can by no means recognise a euphonic or formative *σ* in Greek compounds

latter with the loss of the τ appears in some compounds before consonants without the copulative o in which case the i adapts itself to the organ of the following letter as final m does in Sanscrit hence $e g$ $\mu\epsilon\lambda\alpha\rho\chi\omicron\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ $\mu\epsilon\lambda\alpha\mu\tau\epsilon\pi\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ $\mu\epsilon\lambda\alpha\nu\delta\epsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$, contrasted with $\mu\epsilon\lambda\alpha\iota\omicron\phi\rho\omega\iota$ &c $\tau\alpha\gamma\kappa\alpha\kappa\omicron\varsigma$ $\pi\alpha\rho\chi\alpha\lambda\kappa\omicron\varsigma$ $\pi\alpha\mu\beta\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\varsigma$ $\pi\alpha\mu\mu\eta\tau\iota\varsigma$ $\tau\alpha\iota\delta\alpha\mu\alpha\tau\omega\rho$, $\pi\alpha\nu\tau\epsilon\lambda\eta\varsigma$ opposed to $\pi\alpha\nu\tau\omicron\gamma\omicron\iota\omicron\varsigma$ &c Among bases in ρ , only the monosyllabic $\pi\upsilon\rho$ dispenses in some compounds with the vowel of conjunction hence $e g$ $\tau\upsilon\rho\beta\omicron\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ opposed [G Ed p 1419] to $\pi\upsilon\rho\omicron\beta\omicron\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ Before vowels, the monosyllabic bases $\pi\omicron\delta$ $\pi\alpha\iota\delta$ $\kappa\upsilon\nu$ too appear without a conjunctive o hence, $e g$ $\pi\omicron\delta$ $\alpha\lambda\gamma\eta\varsigma$ $\pi\omicron\delta$ $\epsilon\iota\delta\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$ $\pi\omicron\delta$ $\eta\epsilon\mu\omicron\varsigma$ * $\pi\alpha\iota\delta$ $\alpha\gamma\omega\gamma\omicron\varsigma$, $\pi\alpha\iota\delta$ $\epsilon\rho\alpha\sigma\tau\eta\varsigma$, $\kappa\upsilon\iota$ $\alpha\gamma\omega\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ $\kappa\upsilon\nu$ $\alpha\lambda\omega\tau\eta\zeta$ $\kappa\upsilon\iota$ $\omicron\omicron\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$, so also $\phi\omega\tau$ in some compounds ($\phi\omega\tau$ - $\alpha\gamma\omega\gamma\omicron\varsigma$, &c) and the dissyllabic base $\kappa\omicron\rho\upsilon\theta$ in $\kappa\omicron\rho\upsilon\theta$ $\alpha\iota\zeta$ $\kappa\omicron\rho\upsilon\theta$ $\alpha\iota\omicron\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ Proceeding from bases ending in consonants, the conjunctive vowel o has been communicated also to bases of the third declension ending in a vowel and while $e g$ $\pi\omicron\lambda\iota$ - $\pi\omicron\rho\theta\omicron\varsigma$ $\mu\alpha\nu\tau\iota$ $\pi\omicron\lambda\omicron\varsigma$, $\mu\epsilon\theta\upsilon$ - $\pi\lambda\eta\zeta$ $\gamma\eta\rho\upsilon$ - $\gamma\omicron\iota\omicron\varsigma$, $\beta\omicron\nu$ $\tau\rho\omicron\phi\omicron\varsigma$ $\iota\alpha\nu$ $\sigma\tau\alpha\theta\mu\omicron\varsigma$, correspond well to the above mentioned (§ 968) Sanscrit formations *matī bhramā* & *madhu* *pa* & *gṛ-dhuk* *nāu sliu* & there are no analogous forms to $\phi\upsilon\sigma\iota$ - o - $\lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron$ - ς $\iota\chi\theta\upsilon$ - o - $\phi\alpha\gamma\omicron$ - ς $\beta\omicron(F)$ - o $\tau\rho\omicron\phi\omicron$ - ς , $\iota\eta(F)$ o - $\phi\omicron\rho$ - ς in Sanscrit and the other sister languages In words, however like $\lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\pi\omicron\iota\omicron\varsigma$ (see Buttmann § 120 4) I can neither recognise a declinational ending nor a vowel of conjunction but only the naked base $\lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron$ and therefore consider $e g$ $\nu\epsilon(F)$ o $\mu\eta\iota$ in its first member as identical with the first member of the Sanscrit *naiḥ dala m* young leaf and Slavonic *novogrād* new town (see § 257) In the o too, of words like $\rho\iota\zeta\omicron$ - $\tau\omicron\mu\omicron\varsigma$ $\eta\mu\epsilon\rho\omicron$ $\delta\rho\omicron\mu\omicron\varsigma$ $\delta\iota\kappa\omicron$ $\gamma\rho\alpha\phi\omicron\varsigma$ I cannot recognise a vowel of conjunction but here as generally in words of the first declension where they are found at the beginning of compounds I take the o (=Sanskrit a) for the weakening or

* With transposition of the members of the compound cf p 1415 G c l

-shortening of the \bar{a} or η (from \bar{a} , see § 4), both which vowels, in all feminines, correspond to the Sanscrit \acute{a} (see § 118), even where the \bar{a} has been shortened in the nominative and accusative singular. The change of \bar{a} , \bar{a} , or η , therefore, is like the shortening of the Sanscrit \acute{a} to a in compounds like *priya-bhāryā*, "dear spouse," where the feminine base *priyā* [G Ed p 1420] is changed into the masculine-neuter base by being shortened to *priya*.

970 In remarkable coincidence with the Greek, the Slavonic, too, at the beginning of compounds, weakens the feminine a = Sanscrit \acute{a} (see § 552^a) to the masculine-neuter o (= Sanscrit a , Greek o , see § 257), hence, *e g*, $\text{βοδονοστ} \text{ } vodo-noš$, "hydria," properly, "carrying water" for *voda-noš*, $\text{κοζοδοι} \text{ } koζo-doi$, "caprimulgus" for *koζa-doi*. The latter would, in Sanscrit, be *ajā-dhūk* (theme $-dhūk$). The Greek, however, admits also long vowels at the end of the first member of compounds, and so, *e g*, $\sigma\kappa\iota\bar{a}-\gamma\rho\acute{\alpha}\phi\omicron\varsigma$, $\nu\kappa\eta-\phi\acute{o}\rho\omicron-\varsigma$, resemble the Sanscrit compounds like *chhāyā-karā-s*, "umbrella-carrier," properly, "shadow-maker." $\tau\epsilon\omega-\gamma\rho\acute{\alpha}\phi\omicron\varsigma$ has again lengthened the form $\gamma\epsilon\omicron$, which has been first developed from $\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\alpha$, and $\nu\epsilon\eta-\gamma\epsilon\nu\acute{\eta}\varsigma$, $\lambda\alpha\mu\pi\alpha\delta-\eta-\phi\acute{o}\rho\omicron-\varsigma$, exhibit $\eta = \acute{a}$ for $o = \bar{a}$, as, conversely, η is usually thinned to o . Forms like $\alpha\iota\gamma-\acute{\iota}-\pi\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$, $\nu\kappa\tau-\acute{\iota}-\beta\iota\omicron\varsigma$ (= $\nu\kappa\tau-\acute{o}-\beta\iota\omicron\varsigma$), answer, through their conjunctive ι , to Latin like *noct-i-color*, and so also in forms like $\mu\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\sigma-\acute{\iota}-\pi\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron-\varsigma$, properly, "having long pinions," I can only recognise in the ι a means of composition in accordance with what has been remarked at § 128, and in this I differ from Buttmann (§ 120 Rem 11). Compare, with reference to the first member of such compounds, and the inserted vowel of conjunction, Latin forms like *fæder-i-fragus*. In forms like $\acute{o}\rho\epsilon\iota\beta\acute{\alpha}\tau\eta\varsigma$, the diphthong ei is explained by the dropping of the σ which belongs to the base, while in the Latin compounds *opifer*, *munificus*, *vulni-*

* $\text{κοζα} \text{ } koζa = \text{अङ्गि} \text{ } ajā$, as $\text{κοστ} \text{ } kosty = \text{अस्थि} \text{ } ásthī$, "bone"

ficus for *oper i fer* &c (cf *fæder i fragus*) not only the *r* which corresponds to the Greek *σ* but also the preceding vowel appears to have been passed over* [G Ed p 1421] So too *horr i ficus terr i ficus* may be regarded as abbreviations of *horrōr i ficus terrōr i ficus* (cf *sopōr i fer honor i ficus*) In accordance with the almost universal weakening in Latin of the final vowel to *i* we find in Greek beside the already mentioned *αρχι* and *τερπι*, also *αργι* in *αργι πους αργι οδους* &c *χαλκι* in *χαλκι ιαος χαλκι-οικος μυρι* in *μυρι πιος* and *φοξι* in *φοξι χειλος*

971 The Gothic in my opinion never makes use of a conjunctive vowel in its compounds and does not require one as it has but few bases which end in a consonant and these are principally such as terminate in *n* These, however as in Sanscrit suppress (see § 133) the *n* at the beginning of compounds hence *e g smakka bagms* fig tree (theme *smakkan* nom *smakka* fig) for *smakkan bagms* *auga dauro* window properly eye door for *augan dauro* † as above *rāja-putra s* for *rājan-putra s* ‡ [G Ed p 142] Bases in *r* avoid the harshness of the combination with a

* A somewhat different explanation of *opifex* has been attempted above (p 1322 G ed)

† So in Latin *homi-cida sanguis suga*, for which might have been expected *homi i cida sanguin i-suga* In Greek, in a similar way the *r* is often suppressed in the suffix *μαρ* (from *μαρ*, see § 801) and then the preceding *a* is generally weakened to *o* hence *e g σπέρμα φος* *s* for *σπρματ-ο-φόρος* on the other hand *νμα κλυτος* which in Sanscrit would appear in the form *nama vrutá s* The Latin retains the *n* of *no men* in *nomenclator* without appending a conjunctive vowel

‡ The neuter nom and acc *augo* (see § 141) affords no ground for the supposition that *augōn* is the theme (cf Gabelentz and Löbe Gramm p 129) we cannot therefore in this example speak of the shortening of the final syllable Such an abbreviation, however occurs in inorganic feminine bases in *on* and *ein* (see § 142) hence *gyna kunds* having the sex of women (theme *gynōn* nom *gynō* "woman") *marz sans*, 'sea literally ocean sea (theme *marcin*, nom *marei*)

following consonant by transposition ; hence, *bróthra-lubó*, or *bróthru-lubó*, "brotherly love" *Fidur*, "four" = Sanscrit *chatur* (of the weak cases, and at the beginning of compounds), admits, on the other hand, of the combination of *r* with *dógs* (see § 913), hence, *fidur-dogs*, "every four days," "quartan" As the Gothic, in the nominative and accusative singular, suppresses *a* and *r* of the base, it hereby comes to look as if the said bases properly terminated with a consonant, while the *a* or *r* which enters into the composition seems to be a compositional or conjunctive vowel. Such a compositional vowel, however, I can no more admit in the German languages than in the first and second declension of the Greek and Latin, and as I recognise in Grimm's first strong declension of masculines and neutrals, bases in *a*, and in the masculines and feminines of the fourth, bases in *r*, I look upon the *a* of compounds like *guda-faurhts*, "god-fearing," *veinagards*, "vineyard," and the *r* of such as *gasti-góds*, "hospitable," *gabaur-di-vaurd*, "birth-register," as distinctly belonging to the first member of the compounds; and I regard the said examples as standing in perfect accordance with the above-mentioned (§ 968) Sanscrit compounds like *lókā-pālā-s*, *matī-bhramā-s*.* Just so, in Grimm's third declension, [G Ed p 1423] compounds like *fótu-bandz*, "mon for the feet," *handu-ǵaurhts*, "prepared with the hand," correspond to Sanscrit like *madhu-pā-s*, "honey-drinking," and Greek like *μεθυ-πλήξ*. Bases in *ó* (= *a*, see § 118) shorten that letter to *a*, whereby there results an accidental agreement with the nominative and accusative singular, hence, *e g*, *antha-kunds*,

* I have already, in my review of Grimm's German Grammar (Journal of Lit Criticism, 1827, p 758, "Vocalismus," p 132), shewn that a compositional vowel is altogether unknown in the German languages, and is limited in Latin to the cases in which the first member of the compound terminates with a consonant (*honōr-r-ificus*). In Greek it has by degrees extended itself over the whole third declension, but kept aloof from the first and second, where it is the least needed

earthly (having earthly nature) contrasted with Sanscrit words like *dharaḥ dhara s* earth carrier and Greek like *γῆς φορὸς γῆς-ειδής*. The originally short *a* of masculine and neuter base words is occasionally suppressed for example in *thiudan gards* ' kings house *guth blōstreis* God worshipper (for *guda*) *gud' hus* God's house *hals agga nape* (nape of the neck), *thiu magus* servant properly servant boy (for *thiva*) *sigis-laun* (for *sigisa* see § 935) reward of victory *gut thiuda* the Gothic nation *midyun gards* terrestrial globe * *vein-drugkyā* wine drinker and in some compounds the first member of which is an adjective or pronoun as *hauh harts* magnanimous (literally having a high heart) *laus-handus* having empty hands *anþar leiks* diverse properly like to another To *vein drugkyā* corresponds with respect to the suppression of the final vowel of the first member, the Latin *vin demia* (cf p 1417 G ed Note) Those Gothic substantive bases in *ya* (Grimm's second declension) which before this syllable have a long syllable or more syllables than one suppress the *a* and vocalise the *y* to *i* (cf § 135) hence *e g andi laus* endless for *andya laus*, *arbi numya* heir (taker of [G Ed p 1424] inheritance), on the other hand *frathya mar..eins* deception of the intellect (*frathya n* nom *frathi* see § 153) *iadya bōhōs* pl mortgage (*iadya n* nom *vadi*) The feminine substantive base *thusundyþ*, too in the compound *thusundi faths* *χιλιαρχος* contracts its final syllable to *i* for which its polysyllabicity or the positional length of its penultima may have given occasion Adjective bases in

* As the first member of this compound does not occur in its simple state it is uncertain whether its theme is really *midyuna* in which case I should compare it just as also the feminine base *midumi* (nom *midums*) with the Sanscrit *madhyama* 'medius' In Sanscrit the earth is called among other names *madhyama-loka s* and *madhya l ka s i e* literally, ' the middle world (between heaven and the infernal regions)

ya retain, even when preceded by a long vowel, the full themal form, hence, *hraiṇya-hairts*, "having pure heart" besides which I do not know another compound with an adjective base in *ya* as the first member, for in *midya-sveipens*, "deluge," properly, "earth-inundation," *midya*, though identical with the adjective base *midya*, stands as substantive, while the Sanscrit sister word, *madhya* in the above-mentioned (p 1423 G. ed., Note) *madhyalōkū-s*, "earth," as "middle world," stands as adjective. The pronominal base *alya* = Sanscrit *anya*, "*alius*," corresponds in *alya-luns* to the Greek ἄλλο in ἄλλο-γενής.

972 In Old High German, too, the final vowel of the bases of Grimm's first strong declension, masculine and neuter, has been pretty frequently retained, either unaltered, or weakened to *o* or *e*, hence, *e g*, *taga-rod*, "redness of morn" ("aurora"), *tage-lōn*, "daily pay;" *taga-sterno*, and *tage-sleino*, "lucifer" ("day-star"), *spila-hūs*, *spilo-hūs*, *spile-hūs*, "playhouse," *grape-hūs*, "grave-house" Bases, too, in *i* have occasionally preserved this vowel, or corrupted it to *e*, *e g*, in *steli-got*, "*loci genius*;" *prūti-chamara*, *brute-chamara*, "bride-chamber," *prūti-geba*, "bridal present," *brūti-gomo*, "bridegroom" ("bride's-man") The Lithuanian, exclusive of the obscure compounds in *ninkla-s* discussed above (p 1344 G. ed.), regularly rejects the final vowel, as also the termination *ia*, *ya* (nom. *i-s*, *yi-s*, see

[G. Ed. p 1425] § 135) of the substantive, adjective, and nominal bases, which appear as the first member of compounds, when they have more than one syllable, *e g*, *wyn'-kalnis*, "hill planted with vines" (*uyna-s*, "wine"), *wyn'-mėdis*, "vine," *dyw'-darys*, "wonder-worker" (*dywa-s*, "wonder"), *krau-leidy*s, "one who lets blood" (*krauya-s*, "blood" = Sanscrit *kravya*, "flesh"), *grėk-twanis*, *Sundflut*†, "deluge," *auks'-kalys*, *auksa-kalys*, "goldsmith" (*auksa-s*,

* *Griėka s*, "sin," *twana-s*, "flood" the German word, however, has a vowel-dy nothing to do with "sin," and is in Old High German *sin-fluot*, *sin-flūt*

gold) *auksa-darys* worker in gold , *bar-d' skuttis* or *barzda skuttis* razor properly beard shaving (*barzda f beard*") *did burnis* one that has a great mouth (*did d's* theme *didia* euphonic *didzia* great) *did galwys* he that has a great herd *wien-rugis* one horned (*wiena s* one) *saw redus* obstinate (*saua s suus*)

973 The Zend *as* has been already remarked instead of the naked theme places the nominative singular *as* the first member of its compounds and I have already drawn attention elsewhere to a similar use in Old Persian* It cannot surprise us if in the European sister languages also isolated cases occur in which the nominative singular takes the place of the theme and I differ from Buttmann (§ 120 Note 11) in that I do not hesitate to take the Greek *θεος* of *θεος δотор* in Hes to be just *as* much the nominative as the Zend *daēd* (from *daevas* see § 56^b) in the quite analogous compound *daēd-dāta* produced by the Drietas (Sanskrit *deva* God) In *θεοφάτος* and some other compounds beginning with *θεσ* one easily recognises a contraction of *θεος* Perhaps also in the compounds beginning with *ναυσι* as *ναυσιβατης* (= *ναυβατης*) *Ναυσιθοος*, *Ναυσιθον* *Ναυσιμεδωι*, the nominative *ναυς* is con [G Ed p 1476] tained as representative of the theme† and to it an *i* has been added as conjunctive vowel (cf § 970) if not I should prefer to regard *ναυσι* as a derivative which has been formed from *ναυ*=Sanskrit *nau* with the suffix *σι* (from *τι*) and which has ceased to be used by itself It appears to me less probable that it is the dative plural of *ναῦς* and least of all would I take the *σ* here as euphonic The Gothic *baurgs* of *baurgs iaddyus* town walls I take to be the genitive as it stands in the genitive relation and as this irregular word

* See Monthly Intelligence of the Acad of Lit March 1848 p 135

† I recall attention to the fact that in Sanskrit only monosyllabic words carry the *s* of the nominative into the locative to which a case sign does not properly belong

exhibits, as well in the genitive as in the nominative, the form *baurgs*. In Sanscrit we might take *divas* in *divas-pati-s* as the genitive of *div*, as I also formerly did as, however, there is a compound *divas-prithivy-âu*, "heaven and earth," which is passed over in this explanation, and in which *divas* does not stand in the genitive relation, I now prefer to assume a base *divas*, to be found only in composition, which is also contained in the proper name *divô-dâsa* (see Benfey's Gloss), and whence, too, has proceeded the extended base *divasa*, as in general the suffix *asa* is only an extension of *as*. To the base *divas*, which is only found at the beginning of compounds, corresponds well the Latin *dies* in *dies-piter*. The second part of this compound is indeed only a weakening of *pater*, to be explained according to § 6, but here hardly signifies "father," but, in accordance with its etymology, "ruler" (see § 812). The Greek exhibits a real genitive, which, however, Buttmann (§ 120, Note 11) will not recognise as such, in the compound *νέωσ-οικοί*, in which the singular surprises me as [G Ed p 1427.] as little as in our term *Schiffshauser*, "ships' houses". Moreover, the first part of *οὐδενίος-ωρα* I cannot take otherwise than as the genitive.

974 The Indian Grammarians divide compound words into six classes, which we will now examine separately in the order in which they follow one another in *Vôpadêva*.

FIRST CLASS

Copulative Compounds called *Dvandva* *

This class consists of the compounds of two or more substantives, which are co-ordinate to one another, *i e* which

* The Sanscrit term *dvandva-m*, *i e* "pair," is a reduplicated form formed from the theme *dva*, "two" (cf § 756) — *NB* I spell this word as it is found in the German, but *व* *v*, when compounded with another consonant in Sanscrit, is pronounced like *w*. See Wilson's Grammar, p 5, l 18 — *Translator*

stand in the like case relation and are according to the sense joined together by and. These compounds are divided into two classes the first permits to the last member of the compound the gender which belongs to it and puts it in the dual when only two substantives are joined together of which each by itself stands in the singular relation and in the plural when the compound consists of more than two substantives or when one of the two members so united is in a plural relation. The accent regularly falls on the final syllable of the united base hence e.g. *surya chandramasdu* 'sun and moon'. In the Vedic dialect however one of the two words combined in Dvandva very often receives the accent which belongs to it in its simple state, and in the Dvandvas which occur in the Vedas the first member often stands in the dual at least I think in compounds like *agnī śāśmāu* Agni and Soma* *indrā vārunāu* Indra and Varuna *mitrā varunāu* Mitra and Varuna *indrā vishnu* Indra and [G Ed p 1478] Vishnu. I may venture to regard* the lengthening of the final vowel of the first member of the compound not as purely phonetic but as the consequence of the dual inflection as too I look upon the final *ā* of *dyāvā* heaven in combination with *prithivī* earth (*dyāvāprithivī*) as the Vedic dual termination which has been added to *dyāu* (the strong theme of *dyō*) just like the *ā* in the Vedic compound *pitarā mātārāu* father and mother. As dual too I regard the Zend *āpa* (theme *āp*) in the copulative *𐬀𐬀𐬰𐬭𐬀𐬰𐬀 𐬀𐬀𐬰𐬭𐬀𐬰𐬀* *āpa-urvarē*† water and tree (V S p 40). There occurs also one other Dvandva which we cannot leave unnoticed as compounds of this kind have hitherto

* Cf § 214 p 278 Note* and see Smaller Sans Gram § 589 Note

† Burnouf to whom we owe an admirable disquisition on the greatest part of the 9th chapter of the Yajna does not declare his opinion as to the first member of the copulative compound *āpa urvarē* (Études p 147)

[G Ed p. 1429] nifies "*pour qu'il fût*," nor has it escaped him that *paśu-vīra* may also mean "*les troupeaux et les hommes*" (p. 140), he translates, however, in accordance with Neriensongh, "*car il a, sous son règne, affranchi de la mort les mâles des troupeaux, de la sécheresse les eaux et les arbres*" I admit that *amēṛēśhanta* and *vīra* might also be plural accusatives, and I recall attention on this head to what has been remarked above (§ 231; Note) regarding the manner in which neuter forms have found their way into the plural of masculines. This does not, however, prevent me from letting, in the passage before us, the *a* of the said words, according to § 208, stand for the dual termination, as, in my opinion, it gives a much more suitable sense, if, by taking *paśu-vīra* as Dvandva, we place, not only the males of animals, but animals and human beings

* In the sibilant of this form I recognise neither any connection with the character of the future, nor with that of the desiderative, but simply a phonetic affix, and recall attention to the fact, that the Sanscrit, too, has several secondary roots which have appended a sibilant. In the case before us the Lithuanian *mirsc-tu*, "I die" (pret *miriau*, fut *mir-su*, infin. *mir-ti*), fortuitously coincides with the Zend

of both sexes under the protection of the government of Yama

975 To return to the Vedic Dyandvas I must draw attention to the circumstance that the dual termination which is common to the nominative accusative and vocative is retained also in that case in which the whole word stands in another case relation and the last member therefore ends in *bhyān* or *ī*, e.g. *dyāuṣ prithivī bhyān* 'to the heaven and to the earth' (Yajur XII 2) *indrā pushāh* of Indra and the Sun (I c XXV 2). This phenomenon may be explained by the language having become unconscious that the first member actually carries a case termination whereby remembrance may be drawn to the above mentioned (५ ११) [I c I p 147] Zend idiom by which the nominative singular very commonly takes the place of the theme. If we should also actually recognise in forms like *indrā ngm* simply a phonetic lengthening of the *a* and *i* of the common language we could not, however by this mode of explanation clear up *pitar ā dyāv-ā, pushān ā* and *kshām ā*. It is also important to remark that as Benfey has been the first to notice* where the first member of the Dyandva is separated from the second the former assumes the requisite termination of the oblique cases of the dual but *ā* only there where suitable for the connection with the other words. Thus in a passage cited by Benfey I c of the Rigs (IV 8 11) we find the genitive *mitráyāḥ varunāyāḥ* of Mitra and Varuna on the other hand *dyāuṣ* as accusative dual separated from *prithivī* (Rigs I 62 1). This phenomenon in expressing the numeral relation is owing to the speakers when he names each part of the compound thing which is usually thought of together having

* In his Review of Bohnhagen's Sanscrit Chrestomathy (Cottinger Learned Notices, 1846)

the other in his mind, and this latter thus ideally comprehended under the name of that he mentions (cf § 211 1st Note), so that, therefore, *e.g.*, *dyāvā-pṛthivī**, properly signifies, "Heaven and earth, earth and heaven," hence, too, the name of one member of the compound may be understood, and, *e.g.*, in a passage of the Sâma-Vêda (II 3 2 8 2 and 3), the dual *mitrâ* occurs in the sense of "Mitra and Varuna," and I am of opinion that the dual *ṛódasî*, which, in classical Sanscrit, also signifies "heaven and earth," denotes by its base *ṛódas* only "heaven," though the meaning "earth"

[G Ed p 1431] has also been ascribed to it †. I draw attention here to a similar procedure in several Malay-Polynesian languages, since, *e.g.*, in the New Zealand *tā-ua* (lit. "thou two," therefore, as it were, the dual of the second person) signifies, "thou and I ‡" Here, *ta* answers to the Sanscrit base *tva*, "thou," and *ua*, which, when standing by itself, is *dūa*, to *dva*.

976 Combinations of more than two substantives in one Dvandva appear not to occur in the Vêdic dialect and Zend, at least, I know of no example. Examples in classic Sanscrit are *agni-vâyu-ravibhyas*, "From fire, air, and sun" (Manu, I 23), *gîta-vâdita-nṛityâni*, "Song, instrumental music, and dance" (Arjuna's Journey to Indîa's heaven,

* For *pṛthivyâu*, with the case-termination suppressed, cf p 1205 G ed

† Wilson, perhaps correctly, derives *ṛódas* from *rud*, "to weep," with the suffix *as*, "the heaven" therefore would be here represented as "weeping" ("raining"), and the drops of rain as its tears. This is certainly not more unnatural than when the cloud (*mēghâ*) is represented as "*mingens*" Moreover, the Greek *οὐρανός* admits of being derived from a root which, in Sanscrit, signifies "to rain," viz from *varsh*, *vrish*, with the loss, therefore, of a sibilant, as *χαίρω* from *χαίρω* (Sanskrit root *harsh*, *hrish*) *Οὐρανός*, therefore, would be a transposition of *Foranós*. Regarding the suffix *avo*, see p 1369 G ed

‡ See "On the connection of the Malay-Polynesian languages with the Indo-European," p 87

IV 7) *siddha chārana gandharīdis* by Siddhas Charanas and Gandharīs (I c V 14) In such cases the last member if it does not already for itself stand in the plural relation should evidently express by its plural termination the sum of the whole In the second kind of copulative compounding which is used especially in anthesis or when speaking of the members of the body or of abstract ideas and generally of inanimate things or insects the last member stands in the singular with a neuter termination, the separate members may stand by themselves in the singular dual or plural re [C Ed p 143] lation e g *charācharam* (*chara acharam*) the moveable and immovable (Mānu I 57) *hasta-pādām* hands and feet (I c II 90, *pāda* masc) *anna-pānam* food and drink (Arjuna 4 11) *chhatrōpānaham** umbrella and shoes (Mānu II 246) *yukā-makṣhika matkunam* lice flies and bugs (I c I 40 *matkuna* masc)

977 In Sanscrit adjectives too which are in sense joined by and may be united in compounds which are not indeed reckoned by the Indian grammarians as Dvandvas but can be assigned to none of the six classes with more justice The following are examples *vṛtta pīṇa* round and thick (Arjuna II 19) *hrishitasrag rajōhina* 'having garlands of flowers standing upright and free from dust' (Nal V 25) So in Greek λευκο μελας "white and black A substantive Dvandva base is βατραχομυο, in the compound βατραχομυομαχία frog mouse war In Latin the derivative *suovitautilia* is based on a Dvandva consisting of three members which must have been according to the first kind of this class of Sanscrit compounding (§ 974) *su ovi tauri* according to the second (§ 976) *su ovi taurum* (swine sheep and bull)

* From *chhatra* n, and *upānah* f with *a* added

SECOND CLASS

Possessive Compounds, called *Bahuvrīhi* *

978 Compounds of this class denote as adjectives or [G Ed p 1433] appellatives the possessor of that which the separate members of the compound signify, so that the notion of the possessor is always to be supplied. For this reason I call them "possessive compounds." The last member is always a substantive, or an adjective taken as a substantive, and the first member may be any other part of speech but a verb, conjunction, or interjection. The final substantive undergoes no other alteration but that which the distinction of genders makes necessary, whence, *e g*, *chhāyā*, *f*, "shadow," in the compound *vipulā-chhāyā*, † has shortened its long feminine *ā*, in order to become referable to masculines and neuters. So, in Greek, the feminine final vowel of the bases of the first declension becomes *o* (= Sanscrit *a*), and in Latin *u*, in possessive compounds like *πολύσκιο-ς*, *πολύκομο-ς*, *αἰολόμορφο-ς*, *multi-comus*, *albi-comu-s*, *multi-vius*. The procedure in Old High German is the same, when it places the feminine substantive *farwa* or *farawa*, &c, "colour," at the end of possessive compounds, and then furnishes the whole word, where it refers to masculines or neuters, with the terminations of the said genders, hence, *e g*, nom m *snio-varawar seo*, "sea having the colour of snow" (Graff, III 702), neut *golt-varawaz*, "having the colour of gold." I see, therefore, no occasion to presuppose, for the explanation of such compounds, adjectives which do not exist, otherwise we might, with equal justice, assume in Greek and Latin adjectives like *κομος*,

* This word signifies "having much rice," and it is properly only an example of the kind of compounding here spoken of, as, in Greek and Latin, *πολύκομος*, *multicomus*, might be used to denote the same.

† *Chchh*, euphonic for *chh*, on account of the short vowel preceding

comus hairy " and for Sanscrit an adjective *chhāya s* shady. The Greek has forgotten how to re transform into its feminine shape the *o* which has arisen from *α* or *η* in compounds like *πολυσκιος πολυκομος* and contrasts therefore with Sanscrit feminines like *tipulachchhāyā* having a large shadow " and Latin like [G Ed p 1431] *multicoma albicoma* masculine forms like *πολυσκιος πολυκομος* (see p 1341 G ed) on the other hand the Latin according to the principle laid down in § 6 has changed the final vowels of the bases of the first and second declension frequently into the lightest and most suitable vowel of the three genders *. Hence *e g multiformis difformis biformis imbellis abnormis bilingualis inermis* so also the organic *u* of the fourth declension in *bicornis*, while on the other hand *manus* in the compound *longi manus* has passed into the second declension.

979 Just as the neuter Sanscrit *hrīd* heart (from *hard*) in the possessive compound *suhrīd* friend properly having a good heart has become masculine and is therefore in some cases distinguished from the simple *hrīd* so it happens with the Latin neuter base *cord* in the compound bases *miseri cord* † *concord* *socord* hence the accusatives *miseri cordem concordem socordem* answer to the Sanscrit *suhrīdam* while the simple *cor(d)* as nominative and accusative corresponds to the Sanscrit *hrīd* (euphonio *hrīd*). The Gothic neuter base *hairtan* suppresses in the undermentioned possessive compound the final *n* and ex

* The final *e* of neuters like *difforme* is only a corruption of the *i* at the end of a word (see § 251)

† Properly ' for the unfortunate having a heart, not *cujus cor miseret* so the Gothic *arma hairts* pitiful properly signifies ' having a heart for the poor for in it the adjective base *arma* is contained as the base *miseru* in the Latin *misericos* which base is weakened to *miseri*, according to § 968

hibits then *arma-hanta* as theme, and *arma-hant-s* (Old High German *arme-herzer* in Notk) for *arma-hanta-s*, (see § 135.), as masculine nominative (pl. *arma-hantai*), so *hranya-hants*, "having a pure heart," *hauh-hants* (for *hauha-hants*, "high-minded," properly, "having a high heart" The Greek and Latin, too, occasionally drop a final consonant at the end of possessive compounds, hence, *e g*, in Greek *δμώνυμος*, *ἐπτάστομος*, *ἀναιμος*, *αὔθαιμος*, in Latin, *ersanguis* (properly, "having the blood out," gen. idem, for *ersanguin-is*), *multi-genus* for the latter we might have expected *multi-genor*, if the suffix of the simple word be contained therein uncuttailed, and also without affix, as *us*, *eris* = Sanscrit *as*, *asas*, has retained the old *s* only in the uninflected cases of the neuter (see §. 129.), but for it exhibits *r* in the masculine and feminine (see p 1377 G ed), hence, *bicorpor*, opposed to the simple *corpus*, *corporis* The base *gener* (*genus*, *gener-is*) appears with the inorganic affix of an *i* in *multi-generi-s*. The Greek occasionally appends an *o* to bases ending in a consonant, *e g*, to *πῦρ* in *ἄπυρο-ς*, *θεόπυρο-ς* (properly, "having God's fire"), to *ἕδωρ* in *εὐδρος*, *μελάνυδρος*

980 The Lithuanian uses its possessive compounds for the most part substantively, and adds to their last member as to that of almost all its compounds, the suffix *ia*, nom m *is**, hence, *e g*, *did'-burnis*, "the large-mouthed" (*burna*, "mouth," cf Sanscrit *brú*, "to speak"), *did'-galvis*, "great head" ("having a great head," *galvà*, "head"), *ketur-kampis*, "four-cornered" (*kampa-s*, "corner"), *trikojis*, "three-footed, having three feet" (*kòja*, "foot") The feminine of the Lithuanian possessive compounds, and other classes of compounds, ends, in the nominative singular, in *ė*, from *ia* †, hence, *e g*, *na-bagė*, "the poor," properly, "not

* See § 135, and p 1345 G. ed, Note

† See § 895.

having wealth *, *pus mergē* the half maid (the latter a determinative compound *merga mrid*) [G Ed p 1436] To this belongs the phenomenon that the Sanscrit too adds a derivative suffix to some of its possessive compounds and indeed the same wherewith above (§ 953) our *ig* Gothic *ha ga* has been compared Our compounds therefore like *hochherzig* high hearted contrasted with the Gothic *hauh haurts* are in a measure already prepared through the Sanscrit by compounds like *angushtha matra ha s* having a thumb's length (Nal XIV 9) *mahārasa s* great breasted Without the derivative suffix we can use our possessive compounds like *Dreifuss* *Dierck* *Rothbrustchen* *I angohr* *Gelbschnabel* *Dickkopf* *Grossmaul* Three foot Four corner Red breast Long ear Yellow bark Thick head Great mouth only as appellatives or as words of abuse

951 The accent in the Sanscrit possessive compounds usually rests on the first member of the compound and indeed on that syllable which receives it when the word stands uncompounded This kind of accentuation approaches most closely to that of Greek in which the principle prevails to cast back the accent in all kinds of compounds as far as possible without reference to the accentuation of the separate members in their simple state a procedure by which the compound gains much more of the character of a new ideal unity than if the retention of the accentuation of one of the combined elements preserved for that member its individuality and made the other member subservient to it In the other classes of compounds the Sanscrit usually takes no notice of the accentuation of the single members in their simple state yet

* The simple *baga s* wealth, is wanting cf Sanscrit *bhaga s* and *bhāga s* share 'luck' The masculine *na-bagas* has the suffix *ta* contained in it

hibits then *arma-hanta* as theme, and *arma-hant-s* (Old High German *arme-herzer* in Notk) for *arma-hanta-s*, (see § 135), as masculine nominative (pl *arma-hantai*), so *hanya-harts*, “having a pure heart,” *hauh-harts* (for *hauha-harts*, “high-minded,” properly, “having a high heart.” The Greek and Latin, too, occasionally drop a final consonant at the end of possessive compounds, hence, *e g*, in Greek *ὀμώνυμος*, *ἐπτάστομος*, *ἄναιμος*, *αὐθαιμος*, in Latin, *ersanguis* (properly, “having the blood out,” gen idem, for *ersanguin-is*), *multi-genus* · for the latter we might have expected *multi-genor*, if the suffix of the simple word be contained therein uncurtailed, and also without affix, as *us*, *eris* = Sanscrit *as*, *asas*, has retained the old *s* only in the uninflected cases of the neuter (see §. 128), but for it exhibits *i* in the masculine and feminine (see p 1377 G ed), hence, *bicorpor*, opposed to the simple *corpus*, *corporis*. The base *gener* (*genus*, *gener-is*) appears with the inorganic affix of an *i* in *multi-generi-s*. The Greek occasionally appends an *o* to bases ending in a consonant, *e.g*, to *πῦρ* in *ἄπυρο-ς*, *θεόπυρο-ς* (properly, “having God’s fire”), to *ῥῶμα* in *κύστρος*, *μελάνυδρος*.

980 The Lithuanian uses its possessive compounds for the most part substantively, and adds to their last member as to that of almost all its compounds, the suffix *ia*, nom m *is**, hence, *e g*, *did'-burnis*, “the large-mouthed” (*burna*, “mouth,” cf Sanscrit *brú*, “to speak”), *did'-galvis*, “great head” (“having a great head,” *galvà*, “head”), *ketur-kampis*, “four-cornered” (*kampa-s*, “corner”), *trikojis*, “three-footed, having three feet” (*kòya*, “foot”). The feminine of the Lithuanian possessive compounds, and other classes of compounds, ends, in the nominative singular, in *ė*, from *ia*†, hence, *e g*, *na-bagė*, “the poor,” properly, “not

* See § 135, and p 1345 G ed, Note

† See § 895

having wealth * *pus mergē* the half maid (the latter a determinative compound, *merga* maid) [G Ed p 1436]
 To this belongs the phenomenon that the Sanscrit too adds a derivative suffix to some of its possessive compounds and indeed the same wherewith above (§ 933) our *ig* Gothic *ha ga* has been compared. Our compounds therefore like *hochherzig* high hearted contrasted with the Gothic *hauh haurts* are in a measure already prepared through the Sanscrit by compounds like *angushtha-mātra ka s* having a thumb's length (Nal XIV 9), *mahārasa ka s* great breasted. Without the derivative suffix we can use our possessive compounds like *Dreissuss Iiereck Rothbrustchen Langohr Gelbschnabel Dickkopf Grossmaul* Three foot Four corner Red breast Long ear Yellow beak Thick head Great mouth only as appellatives or as words of abuse.

981 The accent in the Sanscrit possessive compounds usually rests on the first member of the compound and indeed on that syllable which receives it when the word stands uncompounded. This kind of accentuation approaches most closely to that of Greek in which the principle prevails to cast back the accent in all kinds of compounds as far as possible without reference to the accentuation of the separate members in their simple state a procedure by which the compound gains much more of the character of a new ideal unity than if the retention of the accentuation of one of the combined elements preserved for that member its individuality and made the other member subservient to it. In the other classes of compounds the Sanscrit usually takes no notice of the accentuation of the single members in their simple state yet

* The simple *baga s* wealth is wanting of Sanscrit *bhaga s* and *bhīga s* share 'luck'. The masculine *na bagas* has the suffix *ia* contained in it.

does not cast back the accent, but allows it to sink down on the final syllable of the whole base; hence, *e g.*, *mahá-báhu-s*, "a great arm," opposed to *mahá-báhu-s*, "great-armed," while in Greek the possessive compound *μεγαλόπολις*, "great-town [G Ed p 1137] forming," and the determinative *Μεγαλόπολις*, properly, "great-town," have the same accentuation

932 The form *mahá*, in the just-mentioned compounds *mahá-báhu-s* and *mahá-báhu-s*, is an irregular abbreviation of *mahát*, "great" (theme of the weak cases), which, at the beginning of possessive and determinative compounds, drops its *t*, and then the lengthening of the *á* may be regarded as compensation for the consonant that has been dropped. Although in Sanscrit, according to §. 978, all the parts of speech, with the exception of verbs, conjunctions, and interjections, may stand as the first members of possessive compounds, still for the most part, as also in the European sister-languages, adjectives, including participles, appear in this place. I further annex some examples from the *Mahá-Bhârata* *cháru-lóhana-s*, "having beautiful eyes," *bahú-vidha-s*, "of many kinds" (*vidhá*, m or *vidhá*, f. "kind"), *tanú-madhya-s*, "having a thin middle," *virúpa-rúpa-s*, "having a disfigured form" (*irúpa-m*, "form"), *tikshná-dānshtra-s*, "having pointed teeth" (*dānshtrá*, f "tooth"), *lambá-jathara-s*, "having a swagging belly," *sphurád-ōshtha-s*, "having trembling lips" (*sphurāmi*, Cl 6 "I tremble"), *jáyad-ratha-s*, proper name, signifying "having a conquering car," *jitá-kródha-s*, "having subdued anger," *galá-uyatha-s*, "having departed grief," *i e*, "free from grief." The following are examples in Zend *𐬰𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬌𐬎𐬭𐬀* *śrīraōcshan*, "having good oxen" (from *śrīra* and *ucshan*), *kērēšaōcshan*, "having thin oxen" (*kērēša*=Sanskrit *kriśa*)¹, *kērēšāspa*, proper name, "having thin horses" (from *kērēša* and *āspa*), *𐬰𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬌𐬎𐬭𐬀* *shaētō-*

* See Burnouf, "Yagna," p. 328, n 185

puthi 'who has bright (beautiful) children' The following are examples in Greek *μεγα θυμος* [G Ld⁷ p 1438] *μεγα κυδης, μεγα κλεις λευκο πτερος δολιχο σκιος λευκ οφθαλμος βαθυ-στεριος πολυ χρυσος ταιν-τε-λος μελαμ βωλος μελαι-ο-κομος κλυτο -αις κλυτο-βουλος* The following are Latin examples *magn animus multi oculis longi pes albi-color acu pedius**, *letis color fissi-pes flex-animus* Gothic examples are *laui quithr* : having an empty body fist in (for *lausa*), *laus handus* having empty hands " *luusa iaurds* "having wanton, vain words speaking unprofitably (*iaurd, n*, theme *iaurda* word) *hraiuya -haurts* 'having a pure heart (see § 979) Examples in Old High German are *lang lipet* having long life "† *lanch-mueter* long suffering *milt her er* having a mild heart.' For Lithuanian examples see § 980 Examples in Old Slavonic are *милосръдъ* *milo srd* 'merciful' literally having a loving heart *чѣрноокуѣ* *chernoo-okyĭ* black eyed, *бѣлоглави* *byelo-glavy* white headed"‡ The following are examples in Sanskrit of possessive compounds which have a substantive as their first member *bandhu kama* : having love to kindred *tyaktu kama* : having a desire to leave (see § 623) *lāla putra* : having a child as son (Siv II 6) *matrī shashtha* : having the mother as sixth (Ind I 1) in Greek *κυν-ο-φρων* *κυν ο θαρσης βου-κέφαλος, αιδρ-ο-βουλος* in Latin, *anguis*

* Thus compound (according to Festus) should properly be *acu pes* in the theme *acu ped* Through the appended suffix *tu* it answers to the Latin *n n* compounds (§ 980) In Sanskrit the theme would be *ānu pād* (from *ānu*) and in Greek *ωκυ-π νε ωκ π δ νε* The first member of the Latin compound is therefore important to us because adjective bases terminating in an original *u* have elsewhere in Latin universally received the inorganic affix of an *i* (see p 130 G e 1)

† Grass (II p 16) unnecessarily assumes an adjective *lip* 'lively' while we may be satisfied with the substantive *lip* 'life'

‡ The two last examples with the affix of the definite declension

[G. Ed. p 1439] *comus*, *angui-pes*, *ali-pes*, *pudor-i-color* in Lithuanian, *szuk'-dantis*, "having gaps in the teeth" (*szuklė*, "hole, gap"), *szun-galuvs*, "dog's head" (an abusive word), properly, "the dog's headed" (cf. §. 980.). The following are examples in Sanscrit, with a numeral at the commencement *dvi-pád'*, "two-footed," *trichakrá*, "three-wheeled" (Sâma-V), *chátush-pád*, "four-footed" (l. c) in Zend, *bi-zanhra*, "two-footed," *chathru-chašman*, "having four eyes," *cshvas-ashi*, "having six eyes," *hazanhrθ-ghaōsha*, "having a thousand ears" in Greek, *δίπους*, *διπόταμος*, *δίπορος*, *τρίπους*, *τετράκυκλος*: in Latin, *bipes*, *bidens*, *bicorpor*, *tripes*, *tripectorus* †, *quadrupes*, *quadr'-uibs*, *quinq'uefolius* in Lithuanian, *wien'-ragis*, "one-hoined" (*ragas*, "horn," see § 980), *dwi-koyis*, "two-footed," *tri-koyis*, "three foot;" *tri-kampis*, "three-cornered," *tri-galuvs*, "three-headed," *ketur-koyis*, "four-footed" in Slavonic, *чѣтиногоръ yedino-rog'*, "one-hoined," *чѣтырѣногоръ chetvrye-nog'*, "four-footed" (*noga*, "foot") in Gothic, *haihs*, "one-eyed" (see p 418) in Old High German, *ein-hanter*, "one-handed," *ein-ouger*, "one-eyed," *zwei-ekker*, "two-cornered," *feor-fuazzer*, "four-footed" The following are examples of Sanscrit possessive compounds with a pronoun as the first member *svayám-pi'abha-s*, "having lustre by itself" (*svayám*, "self," see § 341, *pi'abhá*, "lustre"), *tád-ákára-s*, "having such appearance," *mád-vidha-s*, "like me," properly, "having the kind of me." Examples in Greek are *αὐτόβουλος*, [G Ed p 1440] *αὐτόδικος*, *αὐτοθάνατος*, *αὐτόκομος*, *αὐτομή-*

* In the weak cases *dvi-pad* The numerals in this kind of composition retain the accent only under certain conditions usually it falls on the final syllable of the whole word (see Aufrecht, "*De accentu compositorum Sanscr*," pp 12, 20

† With an extension of the base *pector* (cf *bicorpor*) by a vowel affix, as in Greek forms like *θεόπυρος* (§ 979 conclusion)

τωρ αυτομοιρος The following are examples with an adverb preceding them in Sanscrit *táthā vidha s* so constituted properly having its kind so *sadā gati s* always having going an appellation of the wind so in Greek *αεικαρπος αειπαθης, αεισθενης* In Sanscrit the *a* primitive, before vowels an very frequently appears at the beginning of this class of compounds in which case the accent sinks down on the final syllable hence *e g a malá s* spotless (not having spots), *a pād* footless *a bala s* weak (not having strength) *a bhayá s* fearless, *an antá s* endless (not having end) Hereto correspond irrespective of the accentuation Greek compounds like *ἄπαις ἄπους* (genit *ἀπὸς* = Sanscrit *a pad-as*), *ἄφοβος, ἄνοικος* The Latin which retains the nasal of the privative particle before consonants also furnishes us with compounds like *inops iners inermis insomnis imberbis imbellis* So in Old Northern *ð hræsi* not having glory gloryless (*hras* praise) *ð máli* not having speech child (*mál* speech) Old High German *unfasel* insect literally not having seed (*fasel* seed Grimm II 776) A Zend example of this class of words is *anaghra* beginningless from *an* and *aghra* = Sanscrit *agra* point beginning (see p 216)

983 For a purpose similar to that for which the privative particle *a* is applied prepositions also which express separation are used in Sanscrit and its sister languages as initial members of possessive compounds *e g* in Sanscrit *apa bhí s* fearless having fear away (*ápa* from away *bhí f* fear) so in Greek *απαθυμος αποθριξ* in Latin *abnormis*, in Gothic *af guds* godless (having God away) in opposition to *ga guds* pious properly having God with निस् *nus* out" before sonant letters *nir* is found *e g* in *nir mala s* spotless properly having the spots out as in Latin *e g ex* [G Ed p 1441] *animis exsanguis expers*, in Gothic *e g us-iéna* theme

uz-vēnan, “hopeless, having the hope out” (*vēn(i)-s*, f “hope”), Old High German, *ur-herzēr*, “excors,” *ur-luzēr* (for *-hl*), “exsors,” *ur-mōt*, “spiritless,” *ur-uāfan*, “un-armed, defenceless” In a sense opposed to that of the privative prepositions, the preposition *sa*, “with”, which occurs only as prefix, is employed in Sanscrit to express persons or things which possess that which the final substantive expresses, *e.g.*, *sá-kāma-s*, “with wish,” i.e. “being with the circumstance of the wish, having a satisfied wish,” *sá-ruy*, “sick, being with sickness,” *sá-rōga-s*, id (*ruch* and *rōga*, “sickness”); *sá-varna-s*, “similar,” properly, “concolor” (*varna-m*, “colour”), *sá-gaiva-s*, “proud, being with pride,” *sá-daya-s*, “sympathizing” (*dayā*, “sympathy”) So in Latin, *e.g.*, *concors*, *consors*, *concolor*, *conformis*, *confinis*, *commodus*, *communis* (for *con* and *munus*, cf. *immunis*), in Greek, *e.g.*, *σύνορος*, *σύνταφος*, *συντελής*, *σύνορκος*, *σύνοπλος*, *σύνομβρος*, *σύνοικος*, *σύνοδος*, *σύγγονος*, *σύνθρονος*, *σύμμορφος*, *συγγάλακτος*, the latter with the extension of the substantive base by *o* (see § 979 conclusion) On the Sanscrit *sa* is based the Greek *σ* (from *σ* for *σα*) in compounds like *σγάλακτος*, *σγάλαξ*, *σδελφός*, *σλοχος*. Mention has already been made elsewhere of the exact retention of the Sanscrit preposition *sa* in the Greek *σαφής*, properly, “with light, being with brightness” In Sanscrit, *bhās*, “brightness,” would regularly combine with *sa* into the compound *sá-bhās*, and this, in like manner, would signify “clear, shining” In Gothic, *ga-guds*, “pious,” properly, “being with God,” belongs to this class of words, being the anti- [G. Ed p 1442.] thesis to the above-mentioned *af-guds* and also *ga-lugs*, “false”†, *ga-darla*, “sympathiser,” “with

* When used alone, *sahá*, as verbal prefix, *sam* The former appears also in the compound *sahadēva-s*, and the latter in some nominal compounds

† Properly, “being with lying” it presupposes a lost substantive *lugs*, “lie.”

portion having (for *ga dauk(1) s* see § 923) *ga hlaiṣa* companion with bread having (for *ga hlaiṣa 1 c*) If I have been wrong in comparing in § 416 the Gothic formations in *leik s* and the forms analogous to them in German with the Sanscrit in *drisa a* they must then be included in the class of compounds under discussion and we must recognise in their concluding element the substantive *leik -s* 'body' then *ga leiks* similar signifies properly with body having having the body i.e. the form in common with another and it would correspond in its formation to the Latin *conformis* Greek *συμμορφος* and Sanscrit *sa-rupa s**. The form *anthar leik -s* separate deducible from *anthar leikē* difference would then literally signify having another body i.e. another form *αλλομορφος* (cf Sanscrit *anyārupa s* 'other shaped' S V II 8 1 4 1).

984 The Sanscrit prefixes *su* and *du* (before sonant letters *dur* cf § 919) like their sister forms in Greek *eu* and *du* stand in the class of compounds under discussion for adjectives whereby *su* allows the accent which belongs to it to sink down on the final syllable of the base or before words which are formed with the suffixes *as* and *man* on the penultima hence *e g su pesās* (nom m f *supesās*) having a good form *sumanas* (nom m f *sumānās*) having a good spirit well intentioned in opposition to *su jīhva s* having a good [G Ed p 1443] tongue (*jīhvā f* tongue) *su-parṇa s* having good wings. The following are examples with *du* *dur bād* *dur ātman* (nom *ma*) having a bad soul *dur bala s* having bad strength *dur mana s* (nom *-manās*) having a bad spirit. To the latter corresponds irrespective of the accentuation the Greek *δυσμενης* (see § 146) as

* I likewise "similar from *sa* with and *rupa* 'form, so *anurupa s* "similar from *anu* after and *rūpa* form

cύμενής to *sumánas* Other Greek examples belonging to this class are *cύμελής*, *cύμεγέθης*, *cύμορφος*, *cύμηλος*, *δύσμορφος*, *δύσμορος*, *δυσπρόσωπος*, *δύσλκκτρος*. Examples in Zend of this class of words are *𐬵𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬎* *hu-kēiēp*, "having a handsome body," nom. *𐬵𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬎𐬀* *hu-kērēf-s* (see § 40), *𐬵𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬎* *hu-jīti*, "having a good life" (see §. 123), *hu-puthra*, f. *hu-puthrī*, "having handsome children," *𐬵𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬎𐬀* *dus-manaš*, "having a bad spirit," *𐬵𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬎𐬀* *dus-skyāōthna*, "having a bad deed, acting badly," *𐬵𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬎𐬀* *dusch-vachas*, "having bad discourse"

THIRD CLASS.

Determinatives called *Kar madhārāya*

985 The last member of this class of compounds is a substantive or adjective, which is more closely defined or described by the first member. The first member may be any part of speech, excepting verbs, conjunctions, and interjections, the most usual, however, is the combination of an adjective with a following substantive. Adjectives, which have a peculiar theme for the feminine, use, if the concluding substantive be feminine, not the feminine base, but the primary form common to the masculine and neuter. The accent falls most commonly on the final syllable of the united base. The following are examples *divya-lusumā-s*, "heavenly flower," *prīya-bhāiyā*, "dear spouse"

[G Ed p 1444] (not *prīyā-bhāiyā*), *saptaiśhāya-s*, "the seven Rishis," *a-bhayā-m*, "not fear, fearlessness", *ādhrishta-s*, "invincible," *ān-rita-s*, "untrue," *sūprīta-s*,

* Inseparable adverbs and prepositions have the accent at the beginning of these compounds just so substantives which denote the thing with which the person or thing to which the compound refers are compared. To the numerous exceptions from the rules of accent in this class of compounds belong, *inter āha*, the compounds described in § 919, like *su-lābha-s*, "being easily attained," *dur-lābha-s*, "being with difficulty attained."

'much beloved *su purna s* very full *dur-dina-m*
 storm lit hard day *sú niti s* good behaviour
sámí bhukta s half eaten *prá úra s* fore man *i e*
 superior man, *udhi-pati s* regent lord *vi sadrik*
 dissimilar, *ghána syama s* cloud dark black like a
 cloud *syena patvá* (theme *ian*) flying like a falcon
 Examples in Zend are *𐬱𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬭𐬀 perenô mdo* full moon
𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬭𐬀 a mara undying (theme) *𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬭𐬀 amerē-*
shans not dying (see p 1421 G ed Note) *𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬭𐬀 dusch-*
areste-m bad deed bad action *𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬭𐬀 dus*
mate m bad thought, *𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬭𐬀 dusch ucte m* badly
 said *𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬭𐬀 hu mate-m* well thought *𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬭𐬀 hu*
fédhra fem -i very fortunate excellent

986 To this class belong Greek compounds like *μεγαλ-*
εμπορος, μεγαλο-δαιμων, μεγαλο μητηρ, ισο-πεδοι, ευρυ κρειω,
α γνωτος, αν ημερος, ευ δηλος, ευ ανοικτος, δυς-αγγελος, δις
απιστος, ημι κυων, ημι κενος, προ-θυμα, εξ οδος, εφ οδος
 The following are examples of Latin compounds of this
 class *meri dies* properly the middle day from *medi dies*
 (see §§ 17 20) for *medi dies* is *tibi cen* for *tibi cen* from
tibia cen (see § 963) *albo galerus* (see [G Ed p 1445]
 p 1417 Note G ed) *sacri-portus quinque-viri decem viri* (is
 in Sanscrit *saptarshayas* the seven Rishis) *pæn insula*
neg otium in imicus semi deus semi dies semi mortuus bene
dicus male ficus (see § 916) *in felix in sulsus* (see § 490
 Remark 1) *in supidus* (see § 6) *difficilis dis similis pro*
avus pro nepos ab avus ante pes ante loquium con seria
inter rex inter regnum per magnus præ celer præ-dulcis præ
durus In German this mode of forming compounds is
 still in full force in all its varieties (The following are
 examples *Grossvater* grandfather *Grossmutter* grand-
 mother *Grossmacht* great potency *Grosshändler*
 wholesale dealer *Weissbrod* white bread *Schwarz*
brod black bread *Vollmond,* full moon *Halbbruder*
 half brother *hauchoch* high as a house, *federleicht*

"light as a feather," *himmelblau*, "sky-blue," *dunkelblau*, "dark blue," *Unschuld*, "innocence," *Unverstand*, "indiscretion," *unreif*, "unripe," *uneben*, "uneven," *Übermacht*, "overpowering force," *Abweg*, "by-way," *Ausweg*, "outlet," *Beigeschmack*, "false taste," *Unterrock*, "petticoat," *Vorhut*, "vanguard," *schwarzgelb*, "tawny," *Vorrede*, "preface," *Vorgeschmack*, "foretaste," *Vormittag*, "forenoon," *Nachgeschmack*, "after-taste," *Mittheil*, "co-heir," *Mitschuld*, "participation in guilt," *Abgott*, "idol," *Abbild*, "image."

In Old High German only the compounds with *sāmi*, which are wanting in our dialect, will be here mentioned by me as analogous to the above-mentioned (p 1399, l 3) Sanscrit *sāmi-bhuktas*, "half-eaten," Greek *ἡμίκροσ*, Latin *sēmi-mortuus*, viz *sāmi-heil*, "half well," *sāmi-gee*, "*semi-vivus*," *sāmi-wiz*, "*subrufus* ("half white"). The following are examples in Gothic *yugga-lauths*, "young man, youth;" *silba-siuners**, "eye-witness, ἀυτόπτης," *afar-dags†*, "the other (following) day," *anda-vauud*, "answer" ("counter-word"), *anda-vleizn†*, "face, countenance," *ufar-gudya*, "high priest, ἀρχιερός," *ufar-fulls*, "overfull." Examples in Lithuanian are *pus-gimimmas*, "first-birth," *pus-dėvis*, "demi-god,"

[G Ed p 1446] *pus-sessū*, "half-sister," *pus-gyvis*, "half-dead" (literally, "semi-animate"), *pus-salė*, "peninsula," *san-kaivius*, "competitor," *san-leionis*, "co-heir," *prybutis*, "vestibule." Examples in Old Slavonic are *новоградъ* *novo-grad*, "new-town," *всѣславныйъ* *vyse-slavnyĭ*, "entirely famous," *всѣблагыйъ* *vyse-blagyĭ*, "quite good," *всѣгдѣ* *vyse-zar*, "*παμβασιλεύς*," *самовидецъ* *samo-videz*, "eye-

* In case the last member of this compound occurred in its uncompounded state, and that the whole is not, which I consider more probable, a derivative from a to-be-presupposed *silba-siuns*, "self-seeing"

† In Sanscrit *aparāhna-m* (from *apara-ahna-m*) is called "the afternoon," but literally, "the other day" ("the other part of the day")

‡ *Vleizn* does not occur uncompounded

witness, *αυτοπτης* in Russian по идень *pol deny* noon *
по но и *pol nochy* midnight полу богъ *polu-bog* demi-
god свѣтъ зеленъи *svyello-chelenyi* light green"
совладѣше въ *so-ladyetely* "so owner

FOURTH CLASS

Dependent Compounds called Tatpuruṣha

967 This class forms compounds of which the first member is dependent on or is governed by the second and therefore always stands in some oblique case relation Examples in which the first member stands in the genitive relation are contained in § 968 So in Zend e g *𐬨𐬁𐬀𐬭𐬵𐬔𐬌𐬎𐬭𐬀*, *nṁānθ-paili s loci dominus*, *𐬨𐬁𐬀𐬭𐬵𐬔𐬌𐬎𐬭𐬀𐬢𐬀𐬩𐬀*, *nṁānθ-pathni loci domina*, *𐬨𐬁𐬀𐬭𐬵𐬔𐬌𐬎𐬭𐬀𐬰𐬀𐬩𐬀* *paili s urbis dominus* in Greek, *οικο-πιδει στρατο-πιδει οιο-θηκη oiko φυλαξ, θεσαυρο-φυλαξ* in Latin *auri fodina auri fur mus cerda* (see p 1418 G ed Note) *su cerda imbris citor, Marti cullor* in Gothic *veina gards, vineyard aurlī gards ‘kitchen garden iaina-basi grape hena frauja master of the house smakka bagms ‘fig tree* (see § 971) *daura iards, warder keeper of the gate daura iarda [G Ed p 1447] portress door waitress sigis laun guerdon of victory* (for *sigisa laun*) in Lithuanian *uyn -ugė grape (uga berry see § 980) uyn saalė vine (szala = Sanscrit śālā branch)*, in Old Slavonic *домостроитель domo strotely steward вѣтодатель vjeto-davez “light giver богородица bogo todiza mother of God ꙗко глаголющє pyetlo-glashenє gallicinium* (Dobrowsky p 458) Examples in which the first member of the dependent com-

* Lit half day If L. Diefenbach is right as I think he is in comparing the Lithuanian *pusse* half" with the Sanscrit *pārśva*, 'side, the Slavonic *pol* may also be referred to this class and *l* may be regarded as the representative of the Sanscrit *r*, as is done by Miklosich who traces back ПОЛЪ *pol* to पर *para* *ahus*

pound stands in the accusative relation have been given on a former occasion. In Slavonic, водоносъ *vodo-nos'*, "*hydra*," properly, "water-carrier," belongs to this class. In the instrumental relation the first member of the compound appears frequently in Sanscrit in combination with the passive participle in *ta*, and that member then receives the accent which belongs to it in its uncompounded state; hence, e g., *pāti-jushṭā*, "*a marito dilecta*." Thus, e g., in Zend, irrespective of the accentuation, which is here unknown to us, *zarathusthrō-frōcta*, "announced by Zarathusthra," *mazdā-dāta*, "made by Mazda (Ormuzd)." in Greek, *θεό-δοτος*, *θεό-τροπος*, in Gothic, *handu-vaurht'-s*, "made with the hand, *χειροποίητος*" in Slavonic, *рукотворенный* *runko-tvorennyi*, id. (*runka*, "hand," see § 970.) In the dative relation we find, e g., *पितृ* *pitṛi* and *हिरण्य* *hīranya*, in the compounds *pitṛi-sadṛiśa-s*, "like the father," *hīranya-sadṛiśa-s*, "like gold" |, so in Greek, *θεοεικλος*, in Gothic, *gasti-gōds*, "hospitable," literally, "to the guest or guests good," in Russian, *богоподобный* *bogopodobnyĭ*, "Godlike," *богопослушный* *bogoposlyshnyĭ*, [G. Ed. p. 1448] "obedient to God." In the ablative relation stands *नभस्* *nābhas*, "heaven," in the compound *nabhas'-chryutā-s*, "fallen from heaven." In the locative relation is *nāu*, in the above-mentioned *nāu-sthā-s*, "standing in the ship."

988 To the class of dependent compounds belong, too, our German formations like *Singvogel*, "singing-bird," *Springbrunnen*, "well-head," *Ziehbrunnen*, "draw-well," *Schreiblehrer*, "writing-master," *Singlehrer*, "singing-master," *Fahrwasser*, "water-channel," *Esslust*, "desire to eat," *Lesezimmer*, "reading-room," *Scheidkunst*, "analy-

* See §§ 916, 922

† In combination with *sadṛiśa* and *pratiśīpa* the first member takes its proper accent

tical art chemistry *Trinkglas* 'drinking glass' *Trink-
spruch* drinking-speech toast *Kehrbesen* broom
whisking brush *Lehrmeister* instructor *Lebemann*
worldly man epicurean *Lockvogel* decoy bird They
have this peculiarity that the first member is not used
alone, but I can no more regard it as a verb than I can the
first member of the Greek compounds like *δεισι δαιμων* dis-
cussed above (§ 967) I rather look upon it as an abstract
substantive although for some compounds of this kind
the signification of the present participle appears the more
suitable for *Singvogel* is a singing bird *Springbrunnen*
a springing well but *Ziehbrunnen* is not a drawing-
well but a well for drawing *Trinkglas* not a drink-
ing glass but 'a glass for drinking *Schreiblehrer* not
a writing teacher but a teacher of writing as *Tanz-
lehrer* is a teacher of the dance and so too *Singvogel*
may be taken as *Gesangsvogel* *Ziehbrunnen* as *Zugbrunnen*
well for drawing The circumstance that many sub-
stantives occur in the manner cited only at the beginning
of compounds can no more surprise us than another which
has come under our notice that in several members of
our family of languages some classes of adjectives are
limited either solely and entirely or principally to the
end of compounds* In formation the [G Ed p 1449]
substantives of the class of compounds under discussion
and which do not occur so early as in the Gothic are
identical with the theme of the present the class syllable
of which is for the most part suppressed in strong verbs
but retained in some and indeed in the Old High Ger-
man either in its original form *a* (see § 109 1) or in that
of *e* hence *e g tray a stuol* sedan (chair for carrying)
analogous to *trag a mē*s we carry so *trag a bett* pr

* See §§ 909 b 911, 912, 916

lanquin," *trag-a-doina*, "female supporter," "Caryatis," *web-e-hús*, "web-house," "*letrina*" The few remnants of the Sanscrit 4th class (§ 109¹²) contract, in Old High German, the class-syllable *ya* (य *ya*) to *i*, of which *hef-i-hanna*, "midwife," appears to be a solitary example. As *wasku*, "I wash," and *slifu*, "I drag," do not belong to this class, the *i* of *wash-i-wazur* and *slip-i-stern* (literally, "wash-water," "draw-stone"), may be regarded as the weakening of *a*. The syllable *ya* of the first weak conjugation is likewise contracted to *i* (see Grimm, II p. 681), and this latter vowel is frequently weakened to *e*, or entirely suppressed; hence, *e g*, *uez-i-sten*, *uezz-e-slen*, *uez-stán*, "whet-stone" The second and third weak conjugations afford, in Old High German, no examples of this class of compounds, which has continually extended itself in the course of time, and is most numerously represented in New High German Since the weak conjugation, as I think I have proved, is based on the Sanscrit 10th class (see § 109¹⁶), I would further recall attention to the fact that the character of this class is retained in the accusative forms in *ayám* discussed in § 619, and in the Zend infinitives in *ayanm*

FIFTH CLASS.

Collective Compounds called *Dviqu*

989 This class forms collectives, which are more closely defined by a numeral prefixed The final substan-

[G Ed p 1450] tive, without reference to its primitive gender, becomes a neuter, for the most part in *a*, or fem. in *i* The accent rests on the final syllable of the collective base The following are examples *tri-guná-m*, "the three properties" (*guna*, m); *chatur-yugá-m*, "the four ages of the world" (*yuga*, n), *pañchêndriyá-m*, "the five senses" (*indriya*, n), *tri-khatvâ-m* or *tri-khatvî*, "three beds" (*khatvâ*, f), *tri-râtrá-m*, "three nights" (*râtra*, for the

simple *rātri* f), *pañchāgni* the five fires"*, *tri lōka*
the three worlds Examples in Zend are *byāre*
biennium for *bi yāre* (e according to § 30) *chathru māhya*
thri csapare-m 'trinoctium, *chathru māhya*
'four months acc *māhim* (see § 312 and § 42) *nai a csapare m*
pancha māhya acc *-hīm* five months *csuas csapare m*, six nights To these viz to the neu-
ters correspond in Latin *tri vium* point where three
roads meet *bi vium ambuium*† *quadri vium bi-duu-m*
tri duu m for which we may presuppose a simple *duu s* or
du a or *duu m* as an appellation of 'day' for all three
forms *duu-m* according to the Sanscrit principle must be
employed in the compound In Sanscrit *divā* appears as an
appellation of 'day' in the compounds *divā larā s* sun
as day maker *divā man s* likewise sun lit pre-
cious stone of day and *divā madhya-m* noon (middle
of day) The adverb *divā* by day does not suit for
these three compounds From the base *divā* in Latin
after suppressing the *i* we must get *dua* [G Ed p 1461]
The Latin forms like *bi noct u m tri noct-u-m quinqu ert*
u m (see § 6) *bi enn u m* have quitted the original posi-
tion of genuine compounds by annexing a neuter suffix
The Greek prefixes the feminine form of the suffix to the
neuter in *-ov* which latter however is not wanting
Examples are *τριμερια, τριοδια τετραοδια, τετραοδιον* (*quad*
riuium) *τετραυκτια τριυκτιον* (*trinoctium*) In exact accord-
ance with the Sanscrit neuter compounds like *chatur*
yuga m stands *τετραπεπον* on the other hand the Sanscrit
too can from its copulative compounds form with the neu-

* Viz the sun and four fires kindled in the direction of the four quarters of the world to which he who undergoes penance exposes himself

† The *i* of *ambi* is the weakening of the final vowel of the base which in the nominative singular would form were it imaginable, *ambu s*

ter suffix *ya* derivations, which do not alter the meaning of the primary word. Thus, together with the above-mentioned *tri-guṇā-m*, *tri-lōhī*, there exist, too, the forms *trāiḡuṇ'-ya-m*, *trāilōh'-ya-m*, of equivalent meaning, so *chāturiṇn'-ya-m*, "the four castes," from *chaturānā-m*. These, therefore, irrespective of the Viddhi augment, are the true prototypes of Latin forms like *tri-enn'-u-m*, *quadri-enn'-u-m*, &c, and of the Greek *τρι-ὄν'-ιο-ν*, *τρι-ύκτ-ιο-ν*.*

[G. Ed p 1452]

SIXTH CLASS

Adverbial Compounds called *Aiṇyāyibhāṇa*

990 The first member of this class of compounds is either, and indeed most commonly, a preposition, or the privative particle *a*, *an*, or the adverb *yāthā*, "as," and the last member is a substantive, which, without reference to its gender when uncompounded, always assumes the form

* The term "collective compounds" would be unsuitable for this class of compounds, if, with the Indian Grammarians, we included in this class also adjectives like *pañchagava-dhana*, "having the wealth of five bullocks," "five bullocks rich." If, however, we do not regard the having a numeral for the first member as the most important condition of these compounds, I do not see any reason for withdrawing adjectives like that above mentioned from the possessive class, and placing them in a class with the collectives, which are more narrowly defined by a numeral. The word which Indian Grammarians put forth as an example of this class of compounds, viz *dvigu*, is likewise no collective, but an adjective of the class of compounds, with a trifling overplus of meaning beyond what literally belongs to it, "having two bullocks." It should, however, signify, "bought for two bullocks," but must originally have meant scarce aught else but "having the value of two bullocks" = "costing two bullocks." The peculiarity of this compound consists, therefore, only in this, that *dvigu* signifies, by and for itself, not "two bullocks," but "the worth of two bullocks." If *gō*, with a numeral, should form a real collective, its base receives the extension of an *a*, hence, *e g*, *pañcha-gavā-m*, "five bullocks." Cf, with respect to the *a* which is used to extend bases, Latin compounds like *multi-colōr-u-s*, *tri-pector-u-s*, and Greek like *θεό-πυρ-ε-s*

which belongs to the neuter in the nominative and accusative, hence *e.g.* the feminine *śraddhā* 'belief faith' becomes *śraddham* in the compound *yathā śraddham** 'proportioned to faith literally like faith'. The following are other examples *yathā vidhī* 'like prescription corresponding to prescription' (*vidhi* s f) *a saṁśaya m* 'not doubt without doubt' (*saṁśaya m n*) *anu kṣanā m* 'immediately' (*anu* 'after' *kṣana m* 'moment'), *atī mātra m* 'beyond measure' (*mātra m* 'measure') *pratyaham* 'daily' (*prati* 'towards' *ahor n* 'day with n suppressed'). Latin compounds of this kind are *admodum præmodum obviæ affatim* in which however the last member retains its original gender while according to Sanskrit principle *obviæ affatim* must be said for *obviæ affatim*. The following are compounds of this kind in Greek *ἀντιβίον υπερμερὶ παραχρημα*. Some similarity to these adverbial compounds is to be observed [G Ed p 1403] in the Old High German periphrases of superlative adverbs by neuter accusatives with prepositions prefixed which elsewhere govern not the accusative but the dative (see Grimm III 106) *e.g.* Old High German *az yungist ton dem*, *az lā-ōst demum*, *zifurist primum*. We write in one word *zuerst zuletzt zuvorderst zunächst zumeist* &c. A certain likeness to this class of compounds is to be traced also in Greek adverbs like *σημερον τημερον* (see § 315) in which *ημερα* has appended a neuter form in the very same way as the Sanskrit *śraddhā* mentioned above.

INDECLINABLES {

ADVERBS

991 Exclusive of the compounds described in the preceding § adverbs are formed in Sanskrit

* The accent ordinarily rests on the final syllable

1) With particular suffixes, the most important of which have been already considered (see § 420). I must here further mention, that, in departure from §. 291. Remark 2, I now prefer to trace back the Gothic adverbs *hva-drê*, "whither," *hi-drê*, "hither," *gairin-drê*, "thither," *ikcê*, "to" to the Sanscrit pronominal adverbs in *tra* (§ 120). They will therefore have experienced an irregular transformation of the tenuis to the medial, e g, *sudrem*, "parents," contrasted with the Sanscrit *pitárâv*. As regards the *ê* of the said Gothic adverbs, it would lead us to expect in Sanscrit, according to § 69., *â* for *a*. This *â* occurs in the Sanscrit suffix when it is appended to certain substantives and adjectives. Thus we read in the Schol. to Pânini, V 4. 36, *manuṣhyatrâ vasati*, "he dwells among men," *dêvatâ gachchhati*, "he goes to the gods."*

[G. Ed p 1454] 2) With case-forms, e g, the form of adjectives, which is common to the nominative and accusative singular neuter, represents also the adverb. I, however, of course consider the said form to be the accusative, as any oblique case is better adapted than the nominative to denote an adverbial relation. The following are examples *madhurâm*, "lovely, pleasant," *śīghrâm*, *lshiprâm*, *āsū*, "quick," *nītyam*, "ever" (*nītya-s*, "sempiternus"); *churâm*, "long," *prathamâm*, "first;" *dvitīyam*, "for the second time," *bahū*, "much," *bhūtyas*, "more," *bhūtyishṭham*, "most." So in Latin, e g, *commodum*, *plerumque*, *potissimum*, *multum*, *primum*, *secundum*, *amplius*, *recens*,

* In classical Sanscrit I have not met with forms and constructions of this kind: they seem to be limited to the Vêda dialect. Bohtlingk cites, in his Commentary to Pânini, p 230, two passages of the first book of the Rîgvêda in the one (32 7) occurs *purutrâ*, "in many," i e "in many places" or "members" (Schol. *bahushv anvayaishā*), in the other (50 10) *dêvatâ*, in the sense of "among the gods."

facile difficile So in Slavonic the adverbs in *o* are identical with the accusative (nom also) neuter of the corresponding adjective *e g* *мало malo* little, *много mnogo* 'much *долго dolgo* long, a long time To this class belongs in Gothic *filu* 'much very Observe too the adverbial use of neuter adjectives in Greek both in the singular and in the plural as *μεγα μεγαλα μικροι μικρα καλον πλησιοι ταχυ*, ηδν which likewise must of course be regarded as accusatives The adjective base word for *δηροι* long is wanting it is probably, just like *δολιχος* akin to the Sanscrit *dirgha* from *dargha* or *dragha longus* whence the adverb *dirgham* Some Sanscrit adverbs are according to their form plural instrumentals formed from adjective bases in *a e g* *uchchais* high loud from *uchcha*, *nichais* low from *nichu*, *śandais* slow from the unused *sana* [G Ed p 1450] The Lithuanian which forms instrumentals plural in *ais eis* (from *iais*) from bases in *a* and *ia* (*dievais* = Sanscrit *दैवैः* see § 243) exhibits in remarkable conformity with the Sanscrit adverbs also with plural instrumental terminations *e g* *pulkais* frequent from *pulka s* heap, *kartais* at times from *karta s* a time once *wakaraais* in the evening from *wakara s* evening, *nakti mis* by night *pietu mis* at noon The instrumental singular occurs in Sanscrit likewise in some forms which pass for adverbs *e g* in *dākshina n a* southern from *dukshina* *achirē n a* soon literally after not long *alindya* soon literally this day is a dative The Old High German adverbs with a dative plural termination like *lū ihēm* 'paulatim' the Anglo Saxon like *middum in medio miclum mag nopere*, the Old Northern like *longum longe fornum olim* (Grimm III p 94) remind us of the Sanscrit and Lithuanian adverbs first discussed with the plural termination of the instrumental The following are

examples in Sanscrit of adverbial ablatives. *páśhāt*, "hereafter," *árāt*, "near," also "far," *adhastāt*, "under," *pūrastāt*, "before," from the lost bases *páścha*, &c, *áchirát*, "swift," from *áchira*, "not long" To this class have already been referred the Greek adverbs in $\omega\varsigma$ (from $\omega\tau$)* They enrich, to a certain extent, the declension of adjectives by one case, and Buttman (§ 115) remarks that $\omega\varsigma$ may still be regarded as a termination entirely devoted to the inflection of the adjectives. We

[G. Ed p 1456] must, however, here give up the simple rule, that the termination $\omega\varsigma$, nominative and genitive, passes into $\omega\varsigma$, as $\omega\varsigma$ cannot possibly, as an independent case-termination, arise at one time from a nominative, and that of the masculine gender, and at another from a genitive The agreement in accentuation, *e.g.*, of $\sigma\phi\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ with $\sigma\phi\acute{\omega}\varsigma$, of $\kappa\upsilon\theta\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ with $\kappa\upsilon\theta\acute{\upsilon}\varsigma$, $\kappa\upsilon\theta\acute{\epsilon}\varsigma$, corresponds with the phenomenon, that in Greek, as in Sanscrit, the accent regularly remains on the syllable on which the base or the nominative has it, thus, in Sanscrit, from the base *samá*, "like," comes the nominative *samá-s*, acc. *samá-m*, abl *samá-t*, as in Greek from $\acute{\omicron}\mu\acute{\omicron}$ come the analogous forms $\acute{\omicron}\mu\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$, $\acute{\omicron}\mu\acute{\omicron}\nu$, $\acute{\omicron}\mu\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ The following are Latin adverbs with an ablative form, *e.g.*, *continuo*, *perpetuo*, *raro*, *primo*, *secundo*, and in Gothic these have a genuine ablative signification, *e.g.*, *hva-thi ó*, "whither?" *tha-thi ó*, "therefrom" (see § 294 Rem 1), and the following have not an ablative meaning like the Greek in $\omega\varsigma$ and Latin in *ó*. *sintemó*, "always," *snu-*

* See § 183 Since, then, Ahrens ("De dialecto Dorico," p 376) has similarly explained the Doric adverbs in $\acute{\omega}$ ($\pi\acute{\omega}$, $\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\acute{\omega}$, $\alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\omega}$, $\tau\eta\nu\acute{\omega}$), which, as representatives of the adverbs in $\theta\epsilon\nu$ (see § 421), have a genuine ablative meaning By their termination ω , for $\omega\tau$, they correspond admirably to the Gothic adverbs, which are likewise strictly of an ablative nature, like *alyathi ó*, "*alunde*" (see § 294 Rem 1)

mundō hastily &c (1 c.) We have a Sanscrit adverb with a genitive form in *chirāsya* finally literally of the long² so in Greek *ε γ ομοῦ, ποῦ, ἄλλου*, in Gothic *allis* entirely *gistra dagis* yesterday * In Sanscrit *prāhne* in the forenoon is regarded as an adverb with a locative termination as the said case termination without transgressing its original destination as is frequently the case with adverbs stands here quite in its place The language however itself distinguishes *prāhne* from the common locative in this that it forms from it as from a theme the derivative *prāhne tana s* (see § 960) From Latin [G Ed p 1457] we refer to this class as has already been done (p 1227 Note * G ed) the adverbs of the second declension and compare *ε γ novē* with the Sanscrit locative *navē* in the new which is no obstacle to regarding the genitive also *novi* according to its origin as locative (see § 200) As the Lithuanian forms locatives in *e* (see § 197) from bases in *a* but occasionally contrasts *ai* too with the Sanscrit Guna diphthong *ē* (from *ai*) (see p 997) so perhaps its adverbs in *ay ey* (the latter from *ia*) and which spring from bases in *a*, are according to their origin locatives since *ay ey* are not distinguished in pronunciation from *ai ei* (see Kurschat, Contributions II 9) The following are examples *gieray* good well (*giera s* a good man) *zinomay* knowing (*zinнома s* a male acquaintance) *pirmay* before (*pirma s* the first) *tenay* there (Old Prussian *tan s* from *tana s* he see *tenna n*) *didey* very (*didis* great theme *didia* euphonic *didzia*) Ruhig remarks that in Lithuanian adverbs can be formed from

* Matt vi 30 'to morrow' see Gabelentz and Löbe, 1 c. Regarding the comparative adverbs see § 301 Remark and as to High German adverbial genitives, see Grimm III 93

verbs by adding the syllable *nay* to the infinitive, but I believe that the language has arrived in a different manner at adverbs like *laupsin-tinay*, "in a praiseworthy manner" (inf. *laupsinti*, "to praise"), than by appending the syllable *nay* to the infinitive suffix *ti*. I believe, viz. that in Lithuanian abstract bases in *tina-s* existed, which suffix might be added to the root or the verbal theme in the same way as the infinitive suffix *ti*. I presuppose, therefore, e.g., abstracts like *laupsintina-s*, "the praising," *mylētina-s*, "the loving," and I deduce therefrom the adverbs *laupsin-tinay*, *mylēt-tinay*, in the same way as *gieray*, "bene," from *giera-s*, "bonus". I regard the suffix *tina* as identical with the secondary suffix *tvana* (see p 1216 G ed, Note), which forms abstracts in the

[G Ed p 1458] Vêda dialect. With regard to the loss of the *v*, remark the relation of the Lithuanian *sapna-s*, "sleep," to the Sanscrit *svápna-s*. To the Vêdic suffix *tvana*, and in fact to its locative *tvané* (= *tvana*), I refer also the Old Persian infinitives or gerunds in *tanay*, if Oppert is right, as I think he is, in assigning the *t* of *chartanay* and *thastanay* to the suffix, *char-tanay* then ranks itself under the Sanscrit root *char*, "ire," also "facere," "agere," "committere," and *thas-tanay* under *thah*, which Rawlinson compares † with the Sanscrit root *śiṣ*, *śans*, the final sibilant of which is protected by the *t* following. But if it be correct to divide *char-tanay* and

* Benfey refers the *t*, e.g. that of *chartanay*, "to make," to the root, and takes *ana* as the suffix

† "Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society," Vol. XI. p 176. I formerly thought (Glossar Sanscr., a 1847, p v) of a connection of the Old Persian *thah* with the Sanscrit *chaksh*, but if we do not follow Benfey in referring *thastanay* (the original confirms also the reading *thastaniya*) to the Sanscrit root *chêsh*, "to strive," other Persian forms are wanting with *th* for Sanscrit *ch*, though it is true that further instances may be quoted where the Persian ت *th* is substituted for sibilants

thas tanay instead of *chart anay thast anay* in which too Rawlinson recognises gerunds then the agreement with the Lithuanian verbal adverbs under discussion is very remarkable and I think that *laupsin tuay myle-tinay* which Ruhig translates by in a praiseworthy loveable manner signify, according to their origin nothing else than 'in the praising in the loving
in *laudando* in *amando* *

992 There are in Sanscrit also several [G Ed p 140] adverbs which can be referred to no settled principle of formation To this class belong among others the negative particles *a* (as prefix) *na* (see § 371) the adverbs of time *sand* 'ever† *adya* to day (on this day) *śvas*, to morrow (Latin *cras*) *hyas* yesterday *parul* in the past year† *sadyas* simultaneously (probably from *sa* this and *dya* from *dinas* day) the prefixes *su* well *fine* and *du* bad

As in Greek together with the abstracts in *συν* (see p 1216 G ed, Note) there exist adjectives in *συνος* (see Anfrecht Journal of Compar Philol p 482) *e g* *πανσύνος* together with *πανσυνη* and as, in Sanscrit the suffix *tra* which is specially devoted to abstract and with which Pott (I I II p 490) compares the Greek suffix *συνη*, may in the Vêda dialect, form also the future passive participle (see § 830) so in Lithuanian together with the to be presupposed abstracts in *tina s* there exist also adjectives with the signification of the future passive *e g* *bar tina s* 'vituperandus *biyo tina s* 'timendus *ices tina s* "ducendus (*icedu* I lead cf § 102 conclusion) In my opinion it cannot be denied that these formations too have much in common with those in *tina* in Sanscrit and if in Lithuanian where we ordinarily find masculines for Sanscrit neuter substantives, they never existed abstracts in *tina s* we must then derive the adverbs in *tinay* from those adjectives

† Probably from the demonstrative base *sa* (cf *sa du* § 42) and see Gloss Sanscr a 1847 p 307)

‡ From *par* for *para* the other (see § 375) and *ut* a contraction probably of the syllable *ut*, from *utsara* "year Pott (L I II 1 300) rightly compares the Greek *πρσι*

CONJUNCTIONS

993 The different members of the Indo-European family of languages agree in the construction of genuine conjunctions in this point, that they form them from pronominal roots (see § 105), but great difference prevails in specialities, *i e.*, in the choice of the pronouns, whence conjunctions of the same meaning are formed in the various languages

[G Ed p 1460] and groups of languages, so that, *e.g.*, our "*dass*," Old High German *daz*, answers neither to the Sanscrit *yat*, *yáthá*, nor to the Latin *quod*, *ut*, nor to the Greek *ὅτι*, *ὥς*, *ἵνα*, *ὅπως*, nor to the Lithuanian *yog*, *kad*, nor to the Russian *kto*, at least not to the last as an entire word, but only to the concluding portion of it (*to*) (cf § 343) The Old High German *daz* is nothing else than the neuter of the article, and the difference in writing which we make between *das* and *dass* has no organic foundation, as the *s* in the neuter of the pronouns and strong adjectives is everywhere based on an older *z*, and properly should always be written *ß* I see no sufficient ground for regarding, with Graff (V. 39), the conjunction *daz* as the neuter of the relative, though the Gothic *thatei* contains the particle *ei*, which gives relative signification to the demonstrative, but for the conjunction *dass* the demonstrative meaning is more suitable than the relative, and when we say, *Ich weiss dass er krank ist*, "I know that he is sick," this is tantamount to *Ich weiss dieses er ist krank*, "I know this he is sick," and I have, for this reason, already, in my Conjugational-system (p 82), called the conjunction *dass* the article of the verbs We cannot place a verb or a sentence in the accusative relation without prefixing to it a conjunction, *i e.* a pronoun, which is the bearer of the case-relation in which the sentence appears As neuter, too, *dass* is adapted to express the nominative relation thus it does in sentences like, *Es ist*

erfreulich dass er wieder gesund ist It is pleasing that he is well again which is equivalent to *das Wiedergesundsein desselben ist erfreulich* the being well again of that person is pleasing With *dass* be it in the accusative or nominative relation the grammatical sentence the general grammatical scheme is in a manner completed so that after *Ich weiss dass* or *Es ist erfreulich dass* I know that or it is pleasing that the logical import whatever it may be follows As the accusative can express adverbially other oblique case relations also and e.g. the Sanscrit *tat* and *yat* express not only [G Ed p 1461] this and which but also on which account therefore wherefore since &c the instrumental or causal relation and may therefore be substituted for *tena* and *yena* so *dass* too is suited to assume the place of *damit* therewith where the preposition *mit* with takes the place of the instrumental termination which is wanting hence e.g. *Nimm diese Arznei dass (damit) du wieder gesund werdest* Take this medicine that (therewith) thou become well again Like *dass* most of the other conjunctions also always stand in some case relation though it be not formally expressed in the conjunction Our *aber* but properly other (see § 350) like the conjunctions which correspond in sense to it in other languages stands always in the nominative relation as *Er befindet sich nicht wohl, aber er wird doch kommen* He does not feel well but he will come notwithstanding With *aber* therefore the other thing that is to be said begins as antithetical to the preceding In Greek *αλλα* in spite of the difference of accentuation is evidently identical with the neuter plural *ἄλλα* The Sanscrit gives us *tu* which like the Greek *δε* never stands at the beginning of a sentence and which as it appears to me is a weakening of the base *ta* to which we have above (§ 350) referred the Greek *δε* also For *aber* we also find in Sanscrit

hindu from *him*, "what?" and also for the *tu* just mentioned, to which the *kim* serves, in a manner, only as a fulcrum, as *yádi*, "if," to *vá*, and, in Latin, *si* to *ve*, in *yáduá*, *sive*, "or," which *vá*, *ve*, by themselves signify

994 The just-mentioned Sanscrit *yádi*, "if", has sprung, I doubt not, from the relative base *ya*, to which, too, the Gothic conjunction *ya-bai*, of equivalent signification, likewise belongs (see § 383. p 539) on the other hand, the *it* (see § 360) contained in चैत् *chét*, "if," is to be

[G Ed p.1462] classed under the demonstrative base *i*, and can scarcely be any thing else than the neuter of the said base, not occurring in use by itself, and identical with the Latin *id*. It may be left an open question whether the Gothic *iba* of *n̄-iba*, "if not," be a contraction of *ya-ba* (cf *thauh-yaba*), or whether its *i* belong to the base of the Sanscrit *it*, with which the Gothic *i-th*, "but," "if," is also connected in its base. The Latin *si* belongs evidently, like *se-d* and *si-c*, to the reflexive base (cf *sē-bi*). The Greek *cí* might be taken as an abbreviation of *éidi*, and so be compared with यद् *yádi*, to which it would bear nearly the same relation that, *e g*, *φέρει* does to *bhárati*, "he bears". Our *wenn*, "if," is identical with *uann*, "when," and the meaning "if" is still unknown to the Old High German adverb of time *huanne*, *hvenne*. The Old High German expression for *wenn*, and also for *ob*, "whether," is *ibu*, *ipu*, &c. (formally=Gothic *iba*, English *if*), Middle High German *obe*, *ob*, on which our *ob* is based, which has lost the signification "if," the case-relation of which is always accusative, a relation expressed in the Latin *num* and *utrum* also by the form. The transition of the lightest vowel *i* in the Gothic *iba* and Old High German *ibu*, *ipu*, to the heavier *o* of the Middle and New High German *obe*, *ob*, is

* Zend *yēzi*, *yēdhi*, see § 520, § 638 Note, § 703
Rem sub finem (for *yēdhi*, better *yēdhi*)

so far remarkable in that languages become defaced in the course of time usually only by the weakening not by the strengthening of vowels* In Sanscrit the above mentioned *yadi* signifies like the Greek *ei* and [G Ed p 1463] Old High German *i bu i-pu* besides if also whether The Lithuanian *yey* if answers with respect to the diphthong *ey* to the adverbs *ny ey* discussed above (p 1157 G ed) but with reference to its base it is identical with that of the Sanscrit *yádi* (see § 383) In the syllable *gu* of *yey gu* if perhaps (also *yey g*) I believe I recognise the Sanscrit particle *ha* Vedic *gha ghā hā* Greek *γe* discussed above (§ 814 p 1104 Note) and in the *gi* of *yey gi*, albeit although notwithstanding the particle *hi* which occurs without any perceptible meaning or signifies for and in the latter case, too never appears at the beginning of a sentence †

995 From the relative base *ya* spring also in Sanscrit the conjunctions *yat* and *yáthá* that the former in the

* To what has been observed above (§ 383, p 539) regarding the syllables *ba bai* in the conjunctions referred to and of the adverb in *a ba* which spring from strong adjective bases in *a* one more attempt at explanation may be here added according to which *ba* might be based on the Sanscrit *pa* whereby, from the demonstrative bases *a* and *u* the prepositions *á pa* and *u-pa* have arisen The Gothic prefers between two vowels a medial instead of the tenues of the formative suffixes and the terminations while at the end of a word an aspirate is preferred (cf § 823 p 1120) hence the preposition *af* contrasted with the Sanscrit *á pa* cannot hinder us from recognising also in the conjunctions *ya bai n i ba* and in the adjective adverbs in *ba* the Sanscrit suffix *pa* of *a pa u pa prati pa sami pa* = the Latin *pe* of *pro pe nem pe quip pe* (from *quid pe*) *se pe* Then, too in Lithuanian the pronominal adverbs *tai po tai p* so *kittai p* otherwise *kai po kai p* 'as *katrai p* ' in which manner *autrai p* ' in another manner and the conjunctive *yey b* in order to must be referred to this class in respect to their labial in departure from § 383 p 540

† See § 391, where too, mention is made of the Greek *yap*

sense of the Latin *quod*, and like it, according to form, the neuter of the relative, the latter in the sense of *ut*, and, like it, originally signifying "as"*. In the Vêda dialect there is found, also, a conjunction of rare occurrence, *yât*, "that," as adverb, "as," a very interesting form, which was first regarded by Kuhn † as a conjunction, and, according [G Ed p 1464] to formation, as an ablative according to the common declension (for *yásmât*) We have, therefore, in this *yât*, as it were the prototype of the Greek *ὡς*, which corresponds to the said *yât* both in its base (see § 382) and in the significations "as" and "that," and as ablative, if I am right in taking the *ς* of the adverbs in *ως* as a corruption of *τ* ‡ As correlative to *yât*, and, as it were, as twin-brother to the Greek *τὼς*, occurs also, in the Vêda dialect, the demonstrative adverb *tât*, with the signification "so," in a passage of the Fourth Book of the Rîg-Vêda (VI 12), cited by Benfey (Glossary to the Sâma-Vêda, p 75), where, in one verse, *yât* is found with the signification "as," and *tât* with that of "so"

996 Our *so*, where it answers to *wenn*, ought to be regarded as a conjunction, just as much as *wenn*, for in sentences like *Wenn er gesund ist, so wird er kommen*, "If he is well, then he will come," *so* "then" is as much the support of the following sentence, as *wenn*, "if," is of the preceding, and it is quite impossible to translate it in languages in which a corresponding expression is wanting, as they feel no occasion, in constructions of that nature, to introduce the following sentence with a conjunction, or to prefix, as it were, an article to its verb In the later

* Regarding *yâ-thâ*, see § 425, and as to *ut* from *uti* for *cuti*, p 1227 G ed, Note † Regarding the use of the Zend conjunctions *yat*, *yatha*, see § 725, and p 1428 G ed

† See Hoefer's Journal, II p 174.

‡ See § 183, and p 1445 G ed

lingual period of the Sanscrit *tadā* originally then (see § 422) has taken on itself the part of this conjunction which corresponds to *yādi* if, and thus we read e g in Lassen's Anthology p 7 *yady ēshā mama bhārya bhavati tadā jivāmi no chēn* (euphonic for *chēt*) *marishyāmi* if this woman becomes my spouse then I will live, if not (then) I will die The Lithuanian gives the neuter of its article viz *tai* and the Slavonic the corresponding *to* = Greek *το* Sanscrit *tāt* this is conjunction for our *so* (see Dobrowsky p 447) The following [G Ed p 1406] is an example in Lithuanian *yey žmonės atleisite juos* *sidėyimus tai atleis ir jums ysus teusas danguyensis* if ye forgive men their trespasses then your heavenly Father will also forgive you (Matt vi 14)

PREPOSITIONS

997 The genuine prepositions and such adverbs as in form and meaning are connected with prepositions admit universally of being derived with greater or less certainty from pronouns according to their signification they are based on such antithetical terms as this and that "this side and that side Thus e g, we may take *uber* over in relation to *unter* under *vor*, before in relation to *hinter* after *aus* 'out in relation to *in* in as 'this side and the counter term is that side or conversely (see § 293) The pronominal origin is most clearly discerned in the Sanscrit preposition *atī* over for according to its formation it has the same relation to the demonstrative base *a* that *iti* so has to *i* It was however the adjectives *a dhara* *s a dhama* *s* the lower or lowest that first led me to perceive the pronominal origin of the old prepositions * It

* See Transactions of the Historic Philological Class of the Royal Academy of Literature for the year 1866 p 91

was later that I first represented the preposition *a-dhás* "under," as adverb, "below," as a derivative from the demonstrative base *a*.^{*} To *á-dhara-s*, *a-dháma-s*, correspond, in Latin, *inferus*, *infimus* (see §. 293, p 379), the former of which Voss derives from the verb *infero*, while [G. Ed p 1466] the Sanscrit *adhúma-s*, in the Upadī-book (V. 54), is formed from the verbal root *av*, "to help," with the suffix *ama*. If we would divide the words thus, *á-dha-ra-s*, *a-dhá-ma-s*, we must then derive these adjectives from *a-dhás*, "under, beneath," the *s* being suppressed, as *áva-ra-s*, *avú-ma-s*, have clearly sprung from the preposition *áva*, "from, down from," though, l. c., *arúma-s*, is assigned to the verbal root *av*, "to help" The former derivation would not prevent us from deriving the prepositional and adverbial *adhás*, "itself," from the demonstrative base *a* by a suffix *dhas*, as a modification of *tas*

998 To *áti*, "over," Zend *𐬀𐬵𐬰 atī*, belongs probably the Latin *at* of *at-avus* (see §. 425), as also the Lithuanian *ant*, "up," with a nasal inserted (cf. §. 293, p. 379), and without a nasal, but with altered meaning, *at*, according to Ruhig, "to, back," only as prefix, e g, in *at-eimi*, "I come here," *at-dūmi*, "I give back" The Greek *ἀντί* and Latin *ante* appear doubtful to me now as derivatives from *atī*, because *ἀντα*, which it is not possible to separate in its origin from *ἀντί*, cannot easily have come from *ἀντί*, though *ἀντί* might have come from *ἀντα* by a very common weakening of *α* to *ι*. But if *ἀντα* be the old form, then *𐬀𐬵𐬰 anta*, "end," presents itself as the medium of comparison, at the root of which, as the opposite to "beginning," i.e. that which is before, lies a prepositional idea† Our *ant* in *Antwort*, "answer," as

* See "On some demonstrative bases, and their connection with different prepositions and conjunctions," 1830, p 9 Cf C G. Schmidt, "*De præpositionibus Græcis*," 1829

† I have literally translated this obscure passage, which means that *𐬀𐬵𐬰 anta*, "end," as the opposite to what is first, or before, may very well be

counter word has already been compared by Thiersch with the Greek *avti* the Gothic *anda* in *anda laurd*, *anda nahti* "evening (properly fore night, or the time meeting night) *anda numfts* acceptance, the taking in front of *anda-nems* agreeable opposed to *and' nima* "I necept speak in favour of *āvta* is the older form In its isolated state and in most compounds too the Gothic preposition on which our *ent* in *entsagen entsprechen* &c [G Ed p 1467] is based has lost its final vowel The Sanscrit substantive base *anta* end has been changed in Gothic to *andya*, nom *andeis* (also *andi* nom *andis*) and the latter substantive has in our *Ende* kept itself free from the second alteration of sound (§ 87) which *ant* and *ent* in *Antwort ent sprechen* &c have undergone In the Veda dialect there is an adverb *anti*, near which recurs too in the later language (see Benfey Gloss) and from which in the first edition of my Glossary without being aware of its existence but presupposing that such a form did formerly exist I have derived the substantive *antika m* nearness It is probable that this *अन्ति anti* has been formed from the demonstrative base *ana* with *a* suppressed and with the same suffix as that which forms *ā ti* from *a* The substantive *अन्त anta* end may however be regarded as the etymological brother of *अन्ति anti* near as it may be derived from the same pronominal root through another but cognate suffix A verbal root suitable for the derivation of *anta* "end" is not to be found at least the root *am* to go to which the Indian Grammarians have recourse (Unadi III 85) does not appear to me to be a dangerous competitor with the demonstrative base *ara*

999 The suffix *fy dhi* of *अधु adhu* over up to wards answers to the Greek *θι* of locative adverbs like *πo-θι*,

be the source from which *avta*, over against has sprung and may itself have a prepositional idea as its base as there is a similar idea at the root of beginning —Translator

ὄ-θι, οὐρανό-θι. The possibility that the Greek ἄρχι may have arisen from ἄνθι for ὄθι, and be akin to अस्मि *ádhi*, has already been noticed (see §. 294, Rem 1., p. 388). I compare with more confidence the Latin *ad*, as also the Gothic *und*, "as far as, up to" (Old Saxon *unt, unt*), if this belong not to अन् *ánta*, "end," and so be originally identical with *anda*, *and*. The great mobility in the transition of meanings in prepositions, combined with the facility of alteration

[G Ed p 1468] in form, causes us here a difficulty in arriving at comparisons which can be entirely depended upon. For comparison with the Gothic preposition *at*, "near, at," we find in Sanscrit no other preposition than *ádhi*. To the Latin *ad* the Gothic *at* would correspond exactly, with regard to the law for the mutation of sounds, but the German languages do not stand in direct connection with the Latin

1000. The Sanscrit preposition *á-pa*, "from," has already been mentioned (p. 1462 G. ed., Note) as an offshoot of the demonstrative base *a*, and as analogous, with respect to its termination, to *á-pa* the Greek ἄ-πό (like ὅ-πό to ἴ-πα), Latin *a-b* (like *su-b* to *u-pa*), Gothic *a-f* (according to § 87.), English *o-f*, our *a-b*, correspond to it. The preposition अस्मि *á-pi*, "over, on," in *api-dhâ*, "to cover," properly, "to lay upon" (as conjunction, "also"), as conjectural derivative of the base *a*, has, with regard to its termination, no analogous form elsewhere. Formally it has the same relation to *á-pa* that, in Greek, ἄν-τί has to ἄν-τα. To *á-pi* corresponds the Greek ἐπί, but with respect to the vowel, and more restricted signification, the Lithuanian *ap* answers better, *e g*, in *ap-auksinu*, "I gild" ("I gild over"), *ap-denkiau*, "I cover" ("I cover over"), *ap-dumbyu*, "I reflect" ("I think over"), *ap-galu*, "I overpower" (*galù*, "I can"), *ap-si-ummu*, "I take upon myself," *ap-beriu*, "I spill" ("I over-fill"), *ap-tuystu*, "I overflow," *api-pyaustau*, "I clip."

* Nesselmann (Lexicon of the Lithuanian Language) remarks regarding

1001 The termination *bhi* of the preposition अभि *abhi* to towards (adv *abhi tar* near) is connected with the case and adverbial terminations beginning with *bh* Zend and Latin *b* Greek *φ* * I recall attention [G Ed p 1169]

ing this preposition that before roots which begin with *p* we sometimes find *api* but rarely before other roots I therefore leave it an open question whether this *a* be the original *a*, or a euphonic affix

* See § 215 I know not why Spiegel has thought it necessary to compare the Zend termination *byo* of the dative and ablative plural with a Sanscrit termination other than that which corresponds in form and signification *bhyas* (see §§ 215 244) He says, however, in Hoffers Journal of Philology I p 60 So *e g* in the declension of words in a several Vedic forms have taken firm root also in Zend thus the nominative plural *asāha* (as I write it *āonha*) to which answers the Vedic in *asah*, and thus the dative plural in *atibyo* to which corresponds the Vedic in *ebhih* I am fully persuaded that the Vedas are altogether innocent of having aught to do with there being plural datives in *atibyo* in Zend, for in the first place the Vedic forms in *ebhis ebhih* are not datives at all and were never regarded by any one else as such but are distinct instrumentals (see § 219) *s condly* even if the Vedic forms in *ebhis* were actually datives still the Zend datives in *atibyo* could not be derived from them as the Sanscrit termination *as* in Zend has never become *y* but has either remained unaltered or has lengthened its *a* thus, instead of the Sanscrit instrumental termination भिस् *bhis* we find *bis* in Zend of frequent occurrence The datives in *atibyo* may at pleasure, be deduced from the Veda dialect or from classical Sanscrit as in both these the form *bhyas* is found in the dative and ablative plural of the *a* bases and thus *ebhyas* is in Zend changed into *atibyo* according to regular rule That the Zend plural forms in *āonh* are based on a peculiarity of the Vedic dialect admits of no doubt and I believe that I was the first to draw attention to this fact (see § 270 and cf Burnouf "Yagna Notes p 73) and indeed at a time when but little was known of Zend forms so as to admit of being brought together for comparison in my Comparative Grammar In general I believe I may in contradiction to an assertion of Spiegel's (Weber's 'Indian Studies I p 303) maintain that the greatest part of what is adduced regarding Zend Grammar in this book and in the Reviews mentioned in the Preface to the First Part (p xiii), is based on my own observation, and I think I have shown

to the Greek locative adverbs *αὐτό-φι*, *ἐύρη-φι* (§ .217), and the Latin datives and adverbs *ti-bi*, *si-bi*, *i-bi*, *u-bi*, *utru-bi* [G. Ed. p 1470.] (§. 223) To the preposition *अभि* *ablí*, the Greek *ἀμφί*, Latin *amb-*, Old High German *umbi* (our *um*) have the same relation, with respect to the inserted nasal, that *ἄμφω*, *ambo*, have to *उभौ* *ubhâi* (theme *ubha*), “both” Under the Sanscrit preposition *ablí* must also be ranked our *bei*, as prefix, *be*, Old High German *bí*, *bi*, Gothic *bi* (see § 88, p 77), with the suppression of the initial vowel, as in Sanscrit, for the above-mentioned (§. 1000) *ápi*, as preposition *pi* is more commonly used than the full form *ápi* thus *pi*, however, would lead us to expect, in Gothic, rather *fi* than *bi*. In Latin, the *amb-* just mentioned need not deter us from bringing *ob* also under this head, as the division of one and the same form into several is nothing uncommon For *amb*, we find also *am* (like our *um* for *umbi*) and *an*, *e g*, in *am-plector*, *am-uio*, *an-fractus* In Zend, likewise, the preposition under discussion appears in two forms, viz. in that of *اړبي* *arbi* and *اړبي* *arui* To another preposition connected with the demonstrative base *a*, the Zend ministers this service, that it still uses its form in its original demonstrative signification with a full declension, I mean, the preposition *áva*, “from,” “down” (see § 377.). The prepositional meaning in the European sister-languages is most clearly represented by the Old Prussian inseparable *au*, *e.g.*, in *au-mû-sna-n* (acc), “ablution” (cf Russian *мою* *moyu*, “I wash”), *au-lau-t*, “to die” (see § 787, p 1062, Note, and cf Sanscrit *lû*, “*abscindere*, *evellere*,” Lithuanian *lauonas*, “corpse”). In Old Slavonic both *oy* *il* and *o* seem to be

shewn that Anquetil's traditional, but, in a grammatical point of view, most faulty, translation of the Zend books might lead to the developement of the grammatical system of the Zend language, even without the aid of the Sanscrit translation of the Yásna by Nerosengh, which often follows the Zend text word for word

assignable to this class, the latter, however not in all compounds (see Dobrowsky p 401) The following are examples
 ойрѣзати *ú-ryežati* *abscindere* оуменьшати *ú maliti*, "*minorare diminuere* оуаааааааа [G Ed p 1471]
ú daliti '*elongare* оугасити *ú gasiti* "*extinguere*, оубогъ *ú bog* '*pauper*' ("*not rich*) омыти *a myti* '*ablucere*
 оотавити *o staviti* *dimittere* оувергати *o provergati*,
depicere abjicere

1002 Besides अव अव, अभि *abhi* too lays claim to the Slavonic preposition *o* which appears in Polish in the forms *obe ob* and *o* and indeed most frequently in the last (Bändke § 210) The following are examples *obe zna ch*, to make known (Sanskrit *abhi jñā* like *jñā* simply to know) *obe-lz wa ch* to calumniate (*lz y ch id*) *obe lgn a ch* 'to adhere round *ob cou a ch* to go about to associate with *ob iazd* riding about *o la a ch* to shew round about *o garn a ch* to embrace (Sanskrit *grih nā-mi* from *grah nāmi* for *grabh nā mi* I take I grasp) *o-grycha ch* to gnaw to nibble round To return to the preposition अव *ava* I do not believe that the Latin *au* of *au fugio au fero* can be compared with it but I hold to the common derivation of this *au* from *ab** on the other hand I believe with Weber that I recognise in *aver nu s* a sister word of the Sanskrit *āvara s inferus* (see p 1466 G ed) which springs from *āva* As regards the addition of the suffix *nu* to the Latin form I would recall attention to the relation of *infer nu s* (with *inferus*) to the Sanskrit *adhara s* (see § 293 p 379) of equivalent meaning Should the Sanskrit preposition *āva* from off be further retained elsewhere in the European languages then in my opinion the Old High German privative *a* (Grimm

* The assimilation to *af fero af fugio* (like *of fero* from *ob fero*) must be avoided because the form *af* has been claimed already by the preposition *ad* (cf I ott E I II 133)



II, p 704) would have the next claim to it As अद् *ápa*, "from," and the corresponding European forms, are used [G Ed p 1472] for negative (see §. 983), so, too, the preposition *áva* would be similarly employed, and, after dropping the semi-vowel, the two short *a* must have been contracted to *á* But if *á* is, as J. Grimm (I c, p 705) assumes, identical in its origin with *ai*, "out," Gothic *us* (cf §. 983) then the Sanscrit *áris*, of which the original signification was probably tantamount to "out," "herefrom," hence "visible, evident," might perhaps have the next claim to the paternity of this preposition, with which, too, an Irish preposition, *viz* *as*, likewise meaning "out," admits of comparison If अस्मद् *áris* be really a preposition, and therefore *áris-bhúta* signify, with reference to the moon, "arisen," properly, "become forth," and *ávishrita* signify "disclosed," properly, "made forth," then the Latin and Greek *ex*, ἐξ, may also be compared with it, so that we should have to assume a hardening of the *v* to *k* (see § 19)

1003 From the demonstrative base *a* comes, in Sanscrit, the adverb *á-tas*, "thence," expressing separation from a place which might, as justly as *a-dhás*, "under" (§ 991), be used as a preposition, and to which the signification "from" would be very suitable This is the meaning in Slavonic of the preposition *отъ o-t'*, which, as regards form, I hold to be identical with the above-mentioned *átas*, with the observation, that the Slavonic *ъ*, almost as commonly as the Latin termination *us*, represents the Sanscrit termination *as*, the *s* of which, according to §. 255 1, must necessarily be dropped, hence, *e g*, *новъ nov'* = Sanscrit *nará-s*, Latin *nomi-s*, *Безомъ vež-o-m'* = *váh-á-mas*, *veh-i-mus* I know, shewn, no termination in which Slavonic *ъ* is based on a most fault, Lithuanian *z*, but for that letter stands *ii* or *h* of the gramm. the Sanscrit *ner*, *e. g*, in *दातु da-si*, "thou givest" = *dádá-si*, the Zend *t* in *दामъ da-my*, "I give" = *dádám*; *томъ to-my*,

'in that = *tā smin* I cannot therefore, with Miklosich (Radices p 60) refer the said *or* *o t* to [G Ed p 1473] the Sanscrit preposition *at* over discussed above (§ 997) although I see no objection in the meaning which in prepositions is very changeable

1004 From the indeclinable demonstrative base *u* which supports itself as enclitic on other pronouns (see Gloss a 1847 p 44) proceed probably the prepositions *उप* *u pa* to towards and *उत्* *u t* up upwards aloft the former being formatively akin to *अ* *pa* from (see § 1000) As in Greek *απο* is related to *u pa* just so is *υπο* to *u pa* only here the rough breathing may cause a difficulty and the more as the Latin *sub* exhibits for it *s* If however it is considered that with the Sanscrit *upa ri* over Gothic *ufa r* also the Greek contrasts *υπερ* and the Latin *super* we shall be readily inclined to regard the rough breathing in Greek and the *s* in Latin in the preposition referred to, as purely a phonetic prefix To this class belongs in Gothic *uf* under to which the Old High German *oba* over our *ob* in *obliegen* to be incumbent *Obdach* shelter *Obhut* protection adv *oben* above correspond with an opposite signification (see Grimm III 253) The Slavonic Lithuanian and Old Prussian have lost the initial vowel as in Sanscrit *pi* occurs together with *अपि* § 1000 hence in Old Slavonic *pa* more frequently *po* as prefix (Dobrowsky p 404) e g, in *ПАМЯТЬ* *pa-mantŭ* 'memory' *ПОМНѢТИ* *po mnye ti* 'meminisse' *ПОМАЗАТИ* *po māzati*, 'inungere' *ПОЛАГАТИ* *po lagati* 'ponere' *ПОДАТИ* *po dati* 'præbere' *ПОСТАТИ* *po-stlati* 'sternere' From *no po* it would appear proceeded *ПОДЪ* *po-d* 'under' and so, too *НАДЪ* *na d* over, from *на* *nge* *pre d* 'before' (*pred iti* *præire* *nge* *pred* *vidyeli* *prævidere*) from *nge pre* though the latter generally signifies *trans* The suffix *d* may perhaps be identical with the Zend *dha* of locative pronominal adverbs (see § 420)

[G Ed. p 1474.] 1005 In Lithuaman, *po*, as a separable preposition, signifies, among other things, "under," *e g*, *po dangumi*, "under the heaven" where, however, it means "after," *e g*, *po pñtù*, "after noon," it springs, probably, from a different source, and is akin to the Sanscrit adverb *paśchāt*, an āblative form of *paścha*⁺, which occurs in no other case, with the primary element of which the Latin *pos-t*, too, is to be compared, but in such wise, that the suffix *t* (from *ti*, cf *pos-ticus*), has nothing to do with the Sanscrit *cha* (from *ka*), though, amongst other words, the Lithuanian *ku*, may be connected with it, in *pas-ku* (= *pasku*), "hereafter," which is perhaps a dative (like *wilkui lupu*, §. 177), from the base *pasha*. In Old Prussian, *pans-dan*, with a nasal inserted, means "hereafter," as in the dative termination plural *mans* = Sanscrit *bhyas*, Lithuanian *mus* (§ 215.). With respect to the suffix *dan*, *pans-dan* answers to *purs-dan*, "before," in the primary element of which the Sanscrit *purás* (from *parás*), "before," is easily recognised, of which hereafter. Without suffix, *pas* signifies, in Lithuaman, "near," with the accusative. The inseparable Lithuanian *pa* may partly be based on the Sanscrit preposition *úpa*, "from," *e g*, in *pa-bėgu*, "I run away," *pa-gaunu*, "I pull in, I take away," partly on *úpa*, "to, towards," *e g*, in *pa-darau*, "I prepare" (*darau*, "I make"), *pa-giru*, "I praise" (Old Prussian, *gir-tuer*, "to praise," *po-gir-sna-n*, "praise," accusative), *pa-zintis*, "acquaintance"

1006 Regarding the prepositions which have probably sprung from the base *an* *aná*, "this," see § 373. I formerly imagined | a relationship between the Latin and

* From *pas* (cf. Persian *pes*, "hereafter") and *cha*, as, *uchcha*, "high," from *ut*, "upwards," *ní-cha*, "low," from *n*

† See "On the Demonstrative, and the origin of the Case-sign" in the Transactions of the Historic-Philological Class of the Royal Academy of Literature for 1826

German preposition *in* Greek *en* and the [G Ed p 147a] demonstrative base *i* but the *i* of *in* and the Greek *e* of *en* may easily be regarded as a weakening of *a* as in *inter* = Sanscrit *antar*, and the Gothic adverb *innathro* 'from within' (see § 291 Rem 1 p 381) is much easier explained as coming from the base *and* by doubling the liquid (cf § 879) than from the base *i*. By weakening the final *a* of the Sanscrit base *and* to *u* we get the preposition *anu* after which has the same relation to *and* that the interrogative base *ku* (§ 386) has to the extensively used *ka*. The Slavonic *na* and *na d'* over (cf Greek *ana* * Old Prussian *na no* up Lithuanian *nũ nug* from † appear like *po pod' pa* to have lost an initial vowel. The last part of the compound pronominal base *and* viz. *na* (see § 369) with the weakening of *a* to *i* becomes a preposition with the signification 'down' and is too the source whence our *nieder* Old High German *ni-dar* (see § 294 p 382) has proceeded. There can too be scarce any doubt that the Sanscrit preposition *ni* lies at the root of the Slavonic adverb *niže ni ž'* 'under' † *ž'* consequently would be an appended suffix as perhaps also in *ni ž'* *i ž'* 'out' for which in Lithuanian *isz* (= *ish*) in Old Prussian *is id*. Perhaps the preposition signifying 'out' has lost an initial *n* as *nman* = Sanscrit *nāman* so that the said prepositions at least with regard to their base rank themselves under the Sanscrit *ni s* 'out' which is evidently formed from *ni* by appending *s* as *s* is frequently added to prepositions and indeed without altering their meaning. But though in Sanscrit *nis* has assumed a meaning different from that of *ni* still in /end it has retained that of *ni* 'down' [G Ed p 147b]

* With regard to the *dh* see § 1003 conclusion

† I hold the *g* for an enclitic (cf § 394 conclusion) *u* (*uo*) frequently represents a long *a*, e *g* in *dum* I give = *dad mi*

also, since in this language *nis-had* or *nis-hudh*, *nis-hadh* represents the Sanscrit *ni-shad* (euphonic for *ni-sad*), in the special tenses *ni-shád*, e g., V S. p. 440 *yat ahmí, nmáné . . nāvrika . . nis-hadāt*, "when in this place a woman sits down" If, at the time when the Lettish-Sclavonic languages separated from the Sanscrit, the locative suffix *ha* in Sanscrit (from *य dha*, see §. 420), already existed in this abbreviated form, and, indeed, simultaneously with the more perfect *य dha*, then the suffix *зъ ѝ* of the Sclavonic forms *низъ ni-ѝ*, *изъ i-ѝ*, might be derived from the suffix *ha* (cf *азъ aѝ*, "I," Lithuanian *asz*, with the Sanscrit *ahúm*), and, as has already been remarked, in the *дъ d'* of forms like *подъ pod'*, the elder form of the Sanscrit suffix, preserved in Zend, might be recognised, in spite of its corrupted form

1007. From the above-mentioned (§ 1004.) *úpa* has been formed, as it appears, with the suffix *ri*, the Sanscrit *upá-ri*, and under it is to be classed the Gothic *ufa-r* of equivalent meaning, Old High German *uba-r*, *oba-r*, our *ube-r*, English *oer*, Greek *ὀρέ-ρ*, Latin *super* To the Gothic *ufa-r* correspond as regards their suffix, several locative pronominal adverbs, e g., *hva-r*, "whither?" *tha-r*, "there," *yarna-r*, "yonder," *alya-r*, "elsewhere," *hē-r*, "here." Should, too, the Gothic *uþ*, "on," Old High German *ûf*, our *auf*, come from the Sanscrit preposition *úpa*, so that the old *tenuis* would have remained in Gothic, as that of *svap*, "to sleep," has been preserved in the Gothic *slēpa*, we should then have to assume that the vowel *u* has, by the weaker Guna, become *u* (see §. 27.), and the Guna been replaced in Old High German by lengthening the vowel. But from an older *û* in New High German must come *au* (see §. 76.). It is impossible to compare in any other way the said German preposition with the Sanscrit The Greek presents for comparison *ὕπ-σι*, in the suffix of which we easily recognise the corruption [G Ed p 1477] of *ti*, which appears in Sanscrit in the

prepositions *a ti* 'over', *pru ti* 'towards' 'against', (Greek *πρὸ-τι* *πρὸ-ς*), and the pronominal adverb *i ti* 'thus'. Observe also that the Sanscrit abstract suffix *ti* occurs in Greek after labials only in the form of *σι* hence *e g* *τεπσις* compared with the Sanscrit *trip-ti s* (from *tarp-ti s*) 'contenting satisfying'.

1008 The Sanscrit preposition *ut* 'up upwards' might according to its form be taken as the nominative and accusative neuter of the base *u* in analogy with *tá t ya t* *anya t* &c (see §§ 155 156). In Greek *ὕψ-τερος* *ὕψ-τατος* admit of being compared with this *ut* (see § 102 conclusion), whence likewise, are formed degrees of comparison viz *ut tara s* 'the higher, as prototype of *ὕψ-τερος* and *ut tamá s* 'the highest' with which may be compared in Latin *in timus*, *ex timus*, *ut timus* and *op-timus*, as of cognate formation (see § 291 conclusion). *Optimus* likewise probably contains an obscured preposition and indeed a sister form of the Sanscrit *ápi* 'on, over' (Greek *ἐπι*, § 1000) to which as regards its vowel and the suppressed *i*, it would bear the same relation as *ob* to *अभि* *abhi* (§ 1001). Consequently *op-timus* would properly signify 'the highest'. In Gothic *út*, 'out'. Old High German *úz* our *aus*, English *out* might be referred to the Sanscrit preposition *ut*, so that the long vowel would be just as inorganic or ungrounded as the Guna of the above mentioned *iup*, 'on' (see § 1007). If we compare *út* with *úta* 'without, abroad', we perceive a sort of declension of a base *úta*, whence *út* would be the nominative and accusative (as, *e g*, *vaurd* 'word') *úta* the dative (as *iaurda*) and *uta na* the masculine accusative, according to the pronominal declension like *tha na*, 'the, hi-na, this'. On the latter is based our adverb of place, *hin*, 'towards'. Moreover from the base *úta* has arisen a secondary base *úta thra* whence comes [G Ed p 1478] the ablative *uta thro* 'from without' analogous to *inna thro*, 'from within' and some similar formations (see § 294

Rem 1. p. 384). With respect to the retention of the old tenuis in the Gothic forms *ūt*, *ūta*, &c., in so far as they are really connected with the Sanscrit preposition *ut*, I recall attention to the relation of the Gothic *slēpa* to the Sanscrit *svāpimi* (§ 89), as also of the pronominal neuters like *tha-ta*, "this, the," to Sanscrit like *ta-t* (§ 155.) In Zend, the *t* of the preposition under discussion has been changed into *ʒ* ʒ, or, especially before sonant consonants, into *z* z, hence, e g, *ʒʒ-ʒ-hista*, "stand up, arise" (see §. 757.), *ʒʒ-a-zoyanha*, "thou wast born" (1 c), *ʒʒ-dāta*, "held on high," *ʒʒ-vazaiti*, "he bears on high"

1009 From the preposition *āpa*, "from," comes, in Sanscrit, most probably *āpara-s*, "the other" (see § 375), in the same way as *āva-ra-s*, "the lower," from *āva* (see § 997), and in Zend, *upa-ra**, "superior," "*altus*" (cf Old High German *oba-ro(n)*, "the higher"), from *upa*. Observe, with respect to the signification, the derivation of the Gothic *frama-theis* (theme *frama-thya*) "*alienus*," from *fiam*, "from". From *āpara-s*, came, by Aphæresis, the more current form *pāra-s*, which, like *āpara-s*, *anyā-s*, and, in Latin, *alius*, *aller*, has been assigned by the language itself, through its declension, to the pronouns. moreover, in point of fact, the idea of "other" is not far removed from that of the remote demonstrative. The prepositions which, in my opinion, come from *pāra*, are *prā*, *prāti*, *pūā*, *purās*, *pāni*. *Prā* (insep), formed by a very ancient syncope from *para*, means "before, in front, forwards, [G Ed p 1479] forth". To it corresponds, in Zend, *fra* or *frā* †, in Greek *πρὸς*, in Latin *prō*, in Lithuanian *pa*

* E g, in the possessive compound *uparō-hanyō*, "having a high body," see Burnouf, "Études," p 182

† See § 47. If we take *frā* as the ancient form, we may recognise in it an instrumental, as in the Sanscrit *ma* (cf p 1297 G ed). I recall

(insep) before *e g* in *pra dum* I give provender beforehand *pra dēmt* I commence *pra neszu* I represent, *pra rahus* prophet" (foretelling) *pra stoyu* I quit *, *pra s-oł ti* to dance away *pra girtu* to drink away i.e. by dancing by drinking to squander one's money in Slavonic *nga pra ngo e g*, in *ngadati pra dyed'* *proavus*, *πρᾶβουίς* *pra inul'* ' *pronepos* *ngamati pra-mati*, " first mother *ngonudati pro-uidyeli*, *providere* *ngonovēdati pro po-vyedati* ' *prædicare* *ngoinati pro-liti* *profundere* *ngoroduti pro-ioditi*, " *deducere* in Gothic perhaps *fra-* (cf § 1011) our *ier* (Old High German *fra* transposed *far for fir fer*) *e g* in *fralitan* to leave free to release (to let go) &c *fralunnan* to despise (*lunnan* to know), *fra-quiman* to expend to lay out (properly to make proceed *quiman* to come) *fra bugyan* to sell (*bugyan* to buy) *fra quithan* to curse to execrate' (*quithan* to say) *fra laurkhan* to sin (*laurkhan* to do to make) A weakening of *fra* is *fri* in *fri salts* picture example (*sakan* to admonish to interdict in *sakan* to indicate to describe) Perhaps too the Lithuanian and Slavonic *prī* is a weakening of *pra*

1010 From *pra* may be derived the preposition *prāti* towards unless this is I prefer assuming just like *pra* has come direct from *para* and is therefore an abbreviated form of *para ti* which made its appearance so early as in the time of the unity of language Thus [G Ed p 1480] much appears certain that the suffix of *prā ti* is identical with that of *i ti* thus and *ā ti* on. In Greek *πορι* (Cret *πορι*), *προς* (see § 152 p 167) *πορι* corresponds

call attention to the fact, that in Sanscrit, too evident instrumentals occur as prepositions *e g* *parena* ' over from *para*

* *Stoyu* I stand In Sanscrit *stha* ' to stand receives through *pra* (*prā stha*) the signification ' to proceed

The latter answers, with respect to the loss of the semi-vowel, to the Zend *partu*, which, when isolated, signifies not only "towards," but also "on," "over," *e g*, *barēshnushu partu gamanam*, "on the summits of the mountain," in combination with *vach*, "to speak," it signifies "towards," and the whole means "to answer" (see § 536 Rem) In Lettish correspond *preti*, *preti*, "towards, against," with the accusative, sometimes also with the genitive, in Slovenian, *proti*, "towards," with the dative, in Lithuanian, *priėsz*, *id*, with the accusative. In Latin, *por-*, *pol-*, *pos-*, in forms like *por-ingo*, *pol-luceor*, *pos-sideo*, have arisen most probably, by assimilation, from *pot* (= *ποτί*) or *pod*, and perhaps *præ* has come from *pri*, for *prati* (cf. Pott, I 92, Ag Benary "Doctrine of Roman sounds," p 185)

1011. *Pārā* (insep) is little used in Sanscrit, and signifies "back, away, forth," *e g*, *pārā-vrit*, "to return back" (*vrit*, *vart*, "to go"), *pārā-han*, "to strike back, to drive forth," *pālāy* (for *pārāy*), "to draw back, to flee" (*ay* "to go"), *parāñch* (*parā-añch*), in the weak cases *parāch*, adjective "turned back" (*añch*, "to go"), *pārā-kīsh*, "to draw forth," *pārā-pat*, "to fly away," *pārā-bhū*, "to go to ruin" (*bhū*, "to be, to become") In Lithuanian the corresponding word is *par*, 1. "back," 2. "down" (insep), *e g*, in *par-eimi*, "I come back," *par-uadīnu*, "I call back," *par-pūlu*, "I fall down," *par-si-klaupyū*, "I kneel down," *par-daužiu*, "I plunge down" In Zend the preposition *para* by itself has the meaning "before," in reference to time, and with the ablative[†], and *παρά* corresponds

[G Ed p 1481] in Greek In Slavonic the inseparable preposition *pre*, which generally means "through" or "over, across," might be referred to this class, provided

* See "Crit Gram linguæ Sanscr," p 253 * According to form, the Sanscrit *pārā* seems to be an instrumental as well as the Zend *para*

it does not belong to पार *pārā* the further shore (cf Greek *περᾱ*) or to *pra* or has been derived from different sources according to the difference of its meanings I annex some examples from the Sloveman according to Ant Janezich (Lexicon p 317) *pre bdeti* to watch through, *pre bechi* to outrun *pre bernuti* to throw round *pre bersnuti* to cast beyond *pre biti* to beat to pieces *pre bosti* to stick through to pierce through *pre bresti* to wade through, *pre buditi* to rouse up (Sanskrit *pra budh id*) *pre bulati* to overfill *pre hod* passing over passage *pre-pad* abyss, *pre paditi* to be ruined *pre pis* transcript *pre plaviti* to overflow *pre-poditi* to expel, to drive away (cf Dobrowsky p 417) In Russian this inseparable preposition becomes *переpere* hence *e g* *перебравъся презъ рѣку* *pere braty sya chrez ryeku* 'to go over a river *перебитыи pere-bityi* 'mingled with one another, mixed *перебрасываю pere brasylayu* 'I cast over *перебѣгъ pere-byeg* 'the outrunning *перевалъ pere-val*, 'the ferrying over from one shore to another *переворачиваю pere vorachivayu* 'I turn round *перепладываю pere gladyvayu* I see through I examine The Lettish has lost the final vowel of this preposition and on the other hand retained the old *a* sound of the first syllable unweakened indeed lengthened and uses *pār* (*pahr*) both separate and in compounds, *e g* *sakkis par zellu tek* the hare runs across over the way (see 'Rosenberger's Doctrine of Forms p 170) *par kapt* to overlook *par lukot* overseeing *pār dot* to sell (to give over) *pār eet* to return home to return back In the meaning back this *pār* (according to Lettish ortho- [G Ed p 1482] graphy *pahr*) agrees with the Lithuanian *par* and Sanskrit *parā*, on the other hand the Lithuanian also has a preposition *per* used only separated which signifies through over across *e g* *per tiltan uazoti* 'to drive

over the bridge," *pér naklun*, "through the night," *pér buttan*, "through the house" (see Nesselmann Lexicon, p 285) That the *e* of this *pér*, and the Russian *e* of *pere*, are corruptions of *a*, and that therefore *pér*, *pere*, and the Lettish *pār*, "over, across," are originally one, is self evident it is, however, impossible to decide with certainty whether the Sanscrit *pārā*, "back, forth, away," is the sole source of the Lithuanian, Lettish, and Slavonic preposition under discussion, or whether, in accordance with its signification, in spite of the similarity of form, it is based at one time on *परā* *pārā*, at another with the Greek *πέραν*, *πέρην*, on *परā* *pārā*, "the further shore," which probably proceeds from *pārā-s*, "*alius*" In Sanscrit the neuter accusative, too, of *pāra*, "*alius, remotior, ulterior*," viz *pāram*, is used as a preposition, with the meaning, "on that side, behind," with reference to time, "after" There is also, in Sanscrit, a preposition *parās*, "over, across yonder, on that side," whence the adverb *paras-tāt*, all of them bases of prepositions in the European sister-languages, of similar sound and similar signification The Latin *per* must likewise be brought under this class, and must be compared especially with the Lithuanian *pér*. We have already noticed *peren-*, in *perendie*, as sister-form of *pāra*, "*alius*" (see § 375, p 527) The Latin *re-*, before vowels *red-*, like *prod-*, euphonic for *pro-*, together with the Ossetish *ra-*, admits of being regarded as an abbreviation of *परā* *pārā* (cf Pott, II p 156), for the surrender of the first syllable of a dissyllabic preposition is something so common, that two languages may well accidentally coincide in that point in one and the same word. In Ossetish, *e g*, we have *ra-jurin*, "to answer."

* *Jurin* (infin see p 1269 G ed), "to speak," cf Sanscrit *gir* from *gar*, "voice," and see G Rosen's Ossetish Grammar, p 39 In some other compounds occurring *l e*, *ra*, or, transposed, *ar*, expresses, so far as the

1012 In Gothic the inseparable *fair* as far as its form is concerned might as well belong to *para* around with which I have before (p 63) compared it as to *para*. In any case the *i* of *fair* is a weakening of *o* and the preceding *a* a euphonic prefix according to § 82. With regard to its signification or operation however *fair* to which our *ter* corresponds answers in the cases in which it is not based on *fra* (see p 1479 G ed) better to *para* (with which I have also compared it in my Glossary a 1817 p 210) than to *para*. Perhaps *fair* *faur* *faura* and *fra* are originally one and have all proceeded from *para*, at least *para* back forth away answers just as well for the compounds cited at p 1479 (G ed) and for all our combinations with *ter* and in some respects better than *para*. Thus e.g. the place of our *ter* in *terkommen* to perish *terfallen* to go to ruin *terleiden*, 'to mislead' *terführen* to seduce *terirren* to lead astray " *tergeben* to give away to resign *terschenken*, to bestow *terscheuchen* to scare away *terbreiten* to divulge *terjagen* 'to chase away, *terachten* to despise *terthun* to squander may very well be represented in Sanscrit by *para* exclusive of the circumstance that this preposition as has already been remarked has become of but very rare employment. In the idea of separation removal the Sanscrit *para* and our *ter* coincide and [G Ed p 1481] that which corresponds to the latter in the older dialects (see Grimm II 853)

1013 The meaning of the Zend *para* before is 10

the latter is not to be taken as $=(p)ar(a)$ "appropinquation viz. in *ra tzaicin ar t aicin* to arrive, in opposition to *a t aicin*, 'to depart' the *a* of which can only be a remnant of a more full Sanscrit preposition probably from *āpa* (cf Latin *ab a*) *ar chasin* to bring to opposed to *a chasin* 'to carry forth. From Sjögren's Lexicon I cite in addition *ra radun* to leave off, *ra dtun* to give up to deliver, *ra č'ne chun* 'to step aside to retire

presented in Gothic by *faura*, *fau*, the *u* of which I regard as the weakening of *a*, like that of the Sanscrit *purás*, "before" To the *u*, however, must, in Gothic, according to § 82, an *a* be further prefixed, as, *e g*, in *bauruns* for *burans*, "borne," from the root *bar* = Sanscrit *bhar*, *bhri*, "to bear" On the Gothic *faura*, *fau*, which signifies not only "before," but also "for," are based our *vor* and *fur*. In the Old High German *fora*, *foro*, *for*, *furi*, *fori*, *foie*, &c, the meanings "before" and "for" are not firmly distinguished by the form (see Graff, III 612.) The *i* of *furi* I take to be the weakening of the *a* of *fora* As in Latin gutturals very often stand for labials, *e g*, in *quinque* for *pinque* (§ 313), *coquo* for *poquo* (Sanskrit *pach*, from *pak*, "to cook"), so, perhaps, the *c* of *córam* might be taken as the representative of *p*, and the whole word be referred to the class of words which, in Sanscrit, Zend, and the German languages, signify "before" The Latin *ó*, like the Greek *ω*, stands very commonly for an original *a*, as, *e g*, in *datótem* = *dá-târam*, *sópio* = *svápáyâmi*, wherefore for *córam* we should have to expect in Sanscrit *pâram* (cf Greek *πέρᾱν* *πέρην*), which occurs, not indeed as preposition, but as accusative of the above-mentioned (p 1482 G ed) substantive *pârâ*, "further shore," as in general the lengthening of an *a* in the derivative forms is, in Sanscrit, of very common occurrence.

1014 The Sanscrit *pârî*, "around," Zend *𐬨𐬀𐬯𐬭𐬀* *pairi*, *𐬨𐬀𐬯𐬭𐬀* *pairis*, may be taken either as an abbreviation of *aparî*, and as a derivative from *âpa*, to which it would have the relation that *upâ-rî* has to *ûpa* (see § 1004), or we may presuppose, which appears to me less satisfactory, a base *par*, and look upon *pârî* as its locative so much

[G Ed p 1485] seems certain, that *pârî* is etymologically connected with other prepositions beginning with a labial In Greek, *περί* corresponds, and in Latin, most probably, the *pari* (see § 912) which stands quite isolated in *pari-es*,

and which surpasses *περι* in returning the original vowel. In the same way, in Latin another Sanscrit preposition is preserved in an obsolete compound viz the preposition *vi* which expresses separation and on which our *wi der* Old High German *wi dar* is based (see § 294 p 382). This preposition occurs viz in the Latin *vi dua* which makes itself etymologically known through the Sanscrit sister word *vi-dhavā* widow as the woman robbed of her husband the husbandless for *dhava s* means in Sanscrit man husband, a rare word which however in the term for widow has been widely diffused in the Indo European department of languages. The Gothic form is *vi duvō** (theme *ōn*) the Slavonic *вдова v dova*. As regards the origin of the preposition *vi* it may have sprung by a weakening of the vowel from the base *va* which is preserved in the compound *á va* (see § 377) as *ni* down is most probably connected with the final portion of *aná* (see p 1475 G ed) or it may also come from the demonstrative base *u* whence in Zend the adverb *uti* so (for *u ti* according to § 41) analogously to *i ti* (§ 425) of equivalent signification.

1015 There remains further for discussion among the conjectural derivatives of the Sanscrit *para* the Gothic preposition *fram* von which is *fram* likewise in Old Saxon Anglo Saxon and Old High German and in English from. I look upon *fra m* as an abbreviation of *fra ma* whence the above mentioned (§ 1009) base *fra-ma thya fremd* foreign *αλλοτριος*. In connection with *fram* stands also the comparative adverb [G Ed p 1486] *framis* further *ulterius* (see § 301 (Remark)). This might be rendered into Sanscrit by the above mentioned (see p 1482 G ed) *páram*, but nevertheless the Gothic *m* of *fram framis* has nothing to do with the accusative sign

Occurring once as *vidolo* (Luke vii 12)

of *páram*, but is connected with the derivative suffix of *paramá-s*, which springs from *páa*, "*altus, remotus*," and which, according to its derivation, might just as well signify "*remotissimus*," as "*eximus, altissimus, summus*" With this *paramá-s*, has been elsewhere compared also the Gothic *fru-ma* (theme *fruman*), "*prior, primus*," the Lithuanian *pir-ma-s*, "*primus*," and the Latin "*primus*,"[†] The comparative adverb *framis* has the same relation to the positive base *frama*, that, *e g*, *hauhis*, "*higher*," has to *hauha*, and the preposition *fram*, just like *faur*, has the form of a nominative and accusative neuter, but must of course be taken as an adverbial accusative

1016 The prepositions which spring from the demonstrative base *sa* (see §. 345) signify, all of them, in Sanscrit, "*with*" They are *sahá*, *sam*, *sa*, *sákam*, *sumám*, and *sárdhám* The former corresponds in its suffix, to *i-há*, "*here*" (from *i-dhá*, § 420), and occurs in the Vêdas also in the form of *sadhá* The Zend in this preposition furnishes us with a powerful corroboration of the origin of prepositions from pronominal roots, since it uses *hadhá*, which corresponds to the Vêdic *sadhá* not at all as a preposition, but as a pronominal adverb with the signification "*here*" on the other hand, it employs another form, *hathia* (see §. 420), which is formed from the base *ha* by a locative adverbial suffix, both as a preposition with the meaning "*with*," and as an adverb with the primitive signification "*here, there*." *Sam* and *sa* appear, in Sanscrit, only [G Ed p 1487] as prefixes,[†] but in Zend the feminine accusative form *hanm* occurs also as an isolated preposition governing the genitive ‡ On the Sanscrit *sam*

See Gloss Sanscr, a 1847, p 209

† See § 964, and p. 1441 G ed.

‡ So in a passage of the Vend Sad, p 230, elsewhere cited ("Ann Reg of Lit Crit," Dec 1831, p 817) *hanm nâur-nanm*, "*with women*"

are based the Greek *συν* the Old Prussian *sen* the Lithuanian *san* in *san dora*, "contract (or *san dora*) *san* in compounds like *san tuanis*, 'co hen, *san darbininkas* "co-labourer *su* (separate with the instrumental) the Old Slavonic *съ*, the Old High German *sin* in *sinfol* "diluvium To *sa* corresponds the Greek *α σα*, of the compounds discussed above (p 1141 G ed) With *sākam*, of which I know examples only in the Veda dialect (see Benfey's Glossary) the Latin *cum* may be compared, supposing the first syllable to be suppressed And further the Gothic *ga*, 'with (see p 1111 G ed sub f), admits of being similarly compared with *sākam* The derivation from *स sa* is on that account doubtful because one does not meet with other examples in which an original sibilant has been hardened in German to a guttural It would be better to trace back the Latin *cum*, through the medium of the Greek *συ* to *sam* As regards the violation of the law for the mutation of consonants in the Gothic *ga*, if we derive it from *sukām*, I would recall attention to similar phenomena which have been mentioned before * The Sanskrit *sār-dhām* or *sārd-dham*, "with, I hold to be an adverbial compound, formed, according to § 990, from *sa*, "with and *ardhu*, *arddha* "half, so that the meaning of the substantive has been entirely lost in the whole compound From the pronominal base or which comes to the same thing from the preposition *sa* I derive too, the Vedic adverb *sāchā*, 'simul' which I regard as the instrumental of a to be pre [G Id p 1488] supposed adjective base *सच sā cha* and as analogous with respect to its formative suffix to *ni cha* low, from *ni* and *uch cha* high from *ut* In Old Persian, *hachā* is used as a preposition with the meaning out from without with the ablative just as, in Zend *hacha* which,

with the ablative or instrumental, signifies "out," "from," and with the accusative "for"

1017 In Zend *mat* means "with," and governs the instrumental, and standing by itself, too, expresses the relation "with" According to its formation, it appears to be the accusative (and nominative) neuter of the demonstrative base *ma*, which, in combination with the base *i* (*i-ma*), produces the neuter *i-mat*, "this" (see § 368). Thus, therefore, *mat* would be, in its primary meaning, identical with *सम् sa-m*, *समम् sa-mám*, &c With its theme that of the Greek *με* of *με-τά* admits of being compared, which, in its formative suffix, coincides with that of *κα-τά*, the base of which is identical with that of the Sanscrit interrogative base *ka*. The interrogative signification might easily pass into the demonstrative, and thus *κα* be adapted to the developement of prepositions, as, too, our *hinter*, Old High German *hin-tar*, conducts us back to the Sanscrit interrogative, since the Gothic demonstrative base *hi* (see § 396 and § 293 Rem.), acc. masc *hi-na*, is based on the Sanscrit *hi*, with which we have also to compare the Latin *hi-c* (see §. 394) With the Zend

[G. Ed p 1489] *ma-t*, our *mi-t*, Gothic *mi-th*, with the prepositions beginning with *i*, *w*, in other German dialects, have already been compared (see §. 294. p 383, Note).

1018. The sole verbal root, which, so early as the time of the unity of our family of languages, at least at the

* For examples with the ablative, see § 180 p 198, and § 756, p. 1013, for examples with the accusative, see Brockhaus Glossar., p 403 In the passages in which Benfey ("Glossary to the Cuneiform Inscriptions") makes the Old Persian *hachá* govern the instrumental, I can only acknowledge the ablative, as the ablative of bases in *a*, on account of the regular suppression of the final *t*, is equivalent in sound to the instrumental Regarding the form *anyaná*, "hoste," see Monthly Report of the Academy of Literature, March 1848, p 133

period when the Sanskrit and Zend were still one, produced prepositions may perhaps be the root $\pi\tau$ *tar* τ *tri* whence we have above (p 375) derived the comparative suffix *tara*. This root already combines in itself the signification of a preposition with that of a verb, for it expresses motion with the secondary idea of 'across,' 'through' *tar a tri* means 'he transports, e g, *nadīm* 'over a river'. From the root *tar* springs the preposition *tara* which is of such frequent occurrence in the Vēds governing the accusative and signifying 'across through trans'*. The *i* is evidently a weakening of *a* and the whole word originally an adverbial accusative nēter of an adjective belonging to the class of words described in § 933 C. The Zend 𐬔𐬀𐬭𐬀 *tarō* (e g *tarō haranm* 'over the mountain') of equivalent meaning, has retained the old *a*†. In the Irish dialect of the Celtic corresponds *tar, tair*, 'beyond over through' &c. and *tri* 'through by' &c. Moreover, the Latin *trans* and Gothic *thair* h our "durch," are to be classed under this head but are independent formations from the same root and indeed *trans* for *terans* (cf *terminus* § 178 sub f) is according to its form a participle present, and the Gothic *thair* h corresponds in its formation to the classes of words discussed in § 931 passim. Further, *thair* *lō* (nēter theme *thair* *lan* "hole" "ear" might be referred to the root [G L p 1490] under discussion, which lies beyond the lingual consciousness of the German so that it would properly signify passage $\pi\sigma\sigma\omicron\varsigma$ $\delta\iota\omicron\delta\omicron\varsigma$.

See Fr Rosen on the Rigv, I 19 7 and Benfey's Gloss to the S V.

† See Burnouf "Yagna," p 83 where however as it appears to me wrongly the termination *as* of this and some other prepositions is represented as an ablative ending. We should then have to suppose for *tara* *tiras* a base *tar, tir*.

SUPPLEMENT.

SINCE I wrote that part of my work which treats of the Formation of the Tenses, Shaffarik and Miklosich have brought to light some Old Slavonic forms which were before unknown, and which are too important for me to conclude this work on the Comparison of Languages without a supplementary notice of them. They are as follows —

1) Preterites which deviate from the ordinary formation in that, instead of the *ch* of the 1st person singular and plural, which has been shewn (§ 255 *m*) to come from *s*, they have retained the original sibilant, and thus afford a practical demonstration that the said tense is, without a doubt, essentially identical with those Sanscrit and Greek aorist forms which append the substantive verb to the principal root*. The 3d person plural exhibits the organic *s* for *sh*. To this class must be referred, *e g*, *ѣѣ ѣа-с'*, "I ate," 1st person plural probably *ѣѣѣ ѣа-ѣом'*, 3d person *ѣѣѣ ѣа-ѣан*, from the root *yad* = Sanscrit *ad*, the *d* of which must be suppressed before the *s* of the auxiliary verb, according to the same principle from which, in the 2d person singular, we find *ѣѣѣ ѣа-ѣи* for the Sanscrit *at-si*. Compare, also, Greek aorists and futures like *ἔψευ(δ)-σα*, *ψεύ(δ)-σω*, contrasted with Sanscrit like *átāt-am*, *tót-tyā-m*, from *tud*, "to knock." The Slavonic, as a general rule, does not admit of the combination of a mute with *s*, or the junction of two sibilants; hence, *e g*, *погребѣѣа po-gre-ѣан*, "they buried" (root *grēb*), *ѣѣѣѣѣа s'-tran-s'*, "I terrified" (root *trans*).

[G Ed p 1491.] 2) Preterites which correspond to the Sanscrit aorists of the sixth formations, and to Greek aorists like *ἔλιπ-ο-ν*, *ἔφυν-ο-ν*, *ἔτυπ-ο-ν* (see § 375). In verbs which are based on the Sanscrit 1st or 6th class (see § 109 ^a 1), as the augment is lost in Slavonic, a distinction from the present in this aorist formation is only possible in the persons, in which there exists a distinction between the terminations of the 1st and 2d persons. The 1st person singular ends in *ѣ* which corresponds to the Sanscrit *a* and Greek *o* of forms like *ábudh-a-m*, *ἔφυν-ο-ν* the 3d person plural ends in *ѣа ѣн*, agreeing with the Sanscrit *a-n* and Greek *o-ν* of *ábudh-a-n*, *ἔφυν-ο-ν*. The 2d and 3d person singular end in *ѣ*, as, according to § 255 *l*, the original final consonants are suppressed in Slavonic; hence, *e g*, *нѣѣѣ nes-e*, "thou didst bear," and "he bore," contrasted with Sanscrit and Greek forms like *ábudh-a-s*, *ábudh-a-t*

* See §§ 561—575, and Miklosich, "Doctrine of Forms in the Old Slavic," p 50

φύγες φύγες We may to wit now assume that the aorists in χλ, as ΗΕΙΟΧλ nes-o ch I bore are not used in the 2d and 3d person singular, but borrow these persons from the second aorist (see Miklos 1 c, p 53) If this be the case, then ΕΒΙ by 'thou wast' he was belongs to the Sanscrit fifth aorist formation (see § 573) and answers in the 2d person as exactly as possible to the Sanscrit *ābhu s* and the Greek *εφύ s* in the 3d to *ābhu t* φ The analogy of these forms might also have had its influence on those conjugational classes in which the first aorist formation is altogether wanting in other persons, so that the *bud* mentioned above (§ 561) must be explained according to the self-same principle as that on which rest forms like *nese* and therefore not the verb substantive but only the character of the 2d and 3d person has been dropped after the *i* of *bud*. *Bud* therefore would stand for *bud i t*, in the 2d person, *bud i s* in the 3d *būdit* According to the first-aorist formation we should have to expect *bud i she*

3) Imperfects which like the first aorists append the verb substantive to the theme of the principal verb but so that the latter without reference to the remaining tenses always contains the character of the Sanscrit 10th class and indeed for the most part in the form of *I ye** but the *ch*, *sh* or *s* of the auxiliary verb is always preceded by an *a* or by its occasional representative *I ye* (see Mikl 1 c p 35) in which I recognise the old *a* of the root *वृश् as* which is found still in an uncompounded state in Old Prussian (*asmu, asmai as mu* I am) I divide therefore thus, e g ВѢДѢАЧл *ryed ye och* from БѢДѢРЧл *rye my* for [G Ed p 1492] *ryed my* 'I know, according to the Sanscrit 2d class (वेदि *ved mi*) while the first aorist ВѢДѢЧл *ryed ye ch* the infinitive БѢДѢТИ *ryed ye ti* and the participles preterite БѢДѢВ *ryed ye i* and ВѢДѢАВ *ryed ye l* in like manner follow the Sanscrit 10th class or causal form Compare, e g, in the case before us, ВѢДѢМ *ved āya mi* Prākṛit *lēd ē mi* I make to know † Perhaps АЧл *ach* (from *as*) 2d and 3d person АИЕ *ashe* is the obsolete in its simple form, imperfect of АИМ *yes my* for АИМ *es my* I am and perhaps we ought to recognise the reason of the vowel difference between the imperfect and present in this that *ach* is based on the Sanscrit augmented *āsam* as in general the Slavonic *a* corresponds more frequently to the Sanscrit *a* than to the short *a* which has commonly become *e* or *o* (see § 255 b) Compare—

SANS CRIT

*āsam**āsas*

OLD SLAVONIC

АЧл *ach*АИЕ *ashe*

SANSKRIT	OLD SLAVONIC
<i>āsīt</i>	АШЕ <i>ashe</i>
<i>ās-va</i>	АХОВЬ <i>ach-o-vye</i>
<i>ās-tam</i>	АСТА <i>as-ta</i>
<i>ās-tām</i>	АСТА <i>as-ta</i>
<i>ās-ma</i>	АХОМЬ <i>ach-o m'</i>
<i>ās-ta</i>	АСТЕ <i>as te</i>
<i>ās-a-n</i>	АХН <i>ach-u-n</i>

I recall attention, moreover, to the fact, that in Sanskrit also the root *as* furnishes a tense, of occurrence in composition only, viz the future *syāmi* (see § 648)

4) Remains of the Sanskrit auxiliary future, to which the Greek in $\sigma\omega$, $\sigma\acute{\iota}\omega$ (§ 656), and Lithuanian in *su*, correspond. The Slavonic forms of this kind which have been discovered up to the present time (in Mikl., p 73) all occur in the 1st person singular, e g, ИЗМНУХ *iz-mi-shun*, “*tabescam*” (root *mi*). The other futures mentioned by Miklosich have, all but one, an *n* after the future character *t s*, e g, ОБРЫСНУХ *o-brysnun*, “*tondebo*” (root *bi*); ВЪСКОПЫСНУХ *v’s-kopysnun*, “*claletrabo*” (root *kop*), ПЛАСНУХ *plasnun*, “*ardebo*” (root *pla*), ТЪКЫСНУХ *t’kysnun*, “*tangam*” (root *t’k*). These forms have probably thus arisen.

[G Ed p 1193] character of the verbs discussed in § 496, p 692, has been appended to the future base which ends in *s*, just as if, in Greek, $\lambda\upsilon\sigma\omega$, $\tau\upsilon\psi\omega$, were said for $\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\omega$, $\tau\acute{\upsilon}\psi\omega$. The form БЪГАСЯН *byegasyayun*, from *byeg*, “to run,” stands quite isolated. In case this form, which Miklosich translates by *cursio*, is, according to its formation, a future, then in the syllable *ta sya* we have exactly to the letter the Sanskrit future character *syā*, the *a* preceding answers to that of the infinitive *byeg-a-ti* and analogous forms, and the whole corresponds, as regards the syllable *yu* inserted between the base *byegasyā* and the personal termination *n*, to present forms like ЗНАЮ *znayun*, “I know.” The verb substantive has left us a future participle in the following forms of the definite declension БЫШУШТЕИ *byshunshteye*, “τό μέλλον,” БЫШУШТААГО *byshunsh-taago*, “τοῦ μέλλοντος,” БЫШУШТИИИ *byshunsh-tiumi*, instr pl (Mikl., pp 69, 70). Cf the Zend future participle 𐬨𐬀𐬎𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬭𐬀 *būsyans*, “future,” acc *būsyantēm*, and the Lithuanian *busens*, acc *busentm* (see § 784).

5) Remains of the Middle. For *vye-my*, “I know” (abbreviated from *vied-my* = Sanskrit *véd-mi*), occurs, as Miklosich remarks, in the older MSS. ВѢДѢ *viedye*. This form is explained, correctly in my opinion,

* See §§ 500, 526, p 746 respecting the nasal *ñ*, see § 783 Rem 1

by the said learned man as middle. It corresponds as exactly as possible to the Sanscrit *redē** and like the Sanscrit termination has lost the personal character *ra* which together with the reasons mentioned above (see p. 1200 G. ed.) points to a comparatively later separation from the Sanscrit (cf. § 467). Miklosich however (p. 71) calls the above mentioned *RED* *ryed ye* the sole remnant in Slavonic of the Atmané padam (the middle) which isolation might raise some suspicion of the genuineness, or real middle nature of the said form. This mistrust must however, disappear when we find that several other Old Slavonic forms have great claims to be regarded as middle. The conjugation given by Miklosich (I c. pp. 71-72) of the verbs without a conjunctive vowel *ѣмъ ya my* (from *yo I my*) 'I eat' and *даю даю da my* (from *dad my* 'I give')

supplies four forms as regards sound only two which I am of opinion must be assigned to the middle. I mean the aorist forms of the 2d and 3d person singular *ѣлъ t yast* 'thou didst eat' [G. Cl. p. 1491] *yast* 'he ate', *дасть dast* 'thou gavest', *dast* 'he gave'. Miklosich refers the *s* of these forms to the root and divides *yast dast* if this division be correct the *s* would be a euphonic alteration of the radical *d* and I should then compare *yast dast* in the 2d person to the Sanscrit imperfect middle *āt thās adāt thās* and in the 3d person to the Sanscrit *at ta a dat ta* Zend *das ta* (see § 102 conclusion). The circumstance that the middle of the Sanscrit root *ad* Cl. 2., is hitherto unestablished need not prevent us from presupposing its former existence as in the time of the unity of language the middle must have been much more extensively used than in the present condition of the different members of our lingual stem. The above mentioned Slavonic forms may however be so regarded as that instead of distributing them as Miklosich does *yast dast*, the sibilant may be separated from the root thus *ya s t da s t*. In this view of the subject, to which I give the decided preference the roots *yad, dad†* have dropped their final consonant before the *s* of the aorist, as before that of the 2d person singular (*ya s t da s t* see § 436), and the *s* is in its origin identical with that of *ѣсте ya s te* (ye ate) *дасте da s te* (2d and 3d per. dual) *дасте da s te* (ye gave) *ѣста*

Not *redē* as the Guna is dropped before the heavy terminations (see § 496) while the Slavonic *ryem* retains the Guna vowel (see § 95 e) also before the heavy terminations and hence *егъ yes te* 'ye know' stands for comparison with the Sanscrit *rit tha*.

† The *ad a sta* which occurs in Mahā Bh. III. 13 follows like the corresponding Greek verb the 1st class (see § 103).

‡ *Dad* is base *l* indeed on reduplication but nevertheless passes as Miklosich assumes for a root in Old Slavonic.

da-s-ta, as also with the χ of $\text{IA}\chi\text{B } ya-ch'$, "I ate," $\text{IA}\chi\text{OMB } ya-ch-o-m$ "we ate," $\Delta\Delta\chi\text{B } da-ch'$, "I gave," $\Delta\Delta\chi\text{OMB } da-ch-o-m'$, "we gave" and with the *sh* of $\text{IAIII}\text{A } ya-shan$, "they ate," $\Delta\Delta\text{III}\text{A } da-shan$, "they gave" All these forms belong to the Sanscrit first aorist formation (see § 562 conclusion), and as *yad* and *dad*, by dropping the final *d*, put themselves on the same footing with the roots ending in a vowel, let a comparison be made between $\text{IACTB } ya-s-t'$, "thou atest," $\Delta\Delta\text{CTB } da-s-t'$, "thou gavest," and the Sanscrit middle *a-yá-s-thás*, "thou wentest," and between $\text{IACTB } ya-s-t'$, "he ate," $\Delta\Delta\text{CTB } da-s-t'$, "he gave," and *ayá-s-ta*, "he went," while $\text{IACTE } ya-s-te$, "ye ate," $\Delta\Delta\text{CTE } da-s-te$, "ye gave," would correspond to the active *aya-s-ta*, if *yá*, or, in general, the roots in *á*, admitted the first aorist formation We compare, therefore, more aptly, *a-né-sh-thás*, "thou leddest," *a-né-sh-ta*, "he led" (see § 545) To these forms corresponds also that mentioned by Miklosich,

[G Ed p 1495] p 37, among other aorist and imperfect forms which, with respect to their personal terminations, are to be referred to this class, viz. $\text{BYICTB } by-s-t'$, "*ἐγενέθης, ἐγενέθη*," for which we should find, in Sanscrit, *ábhó-sh-thás*, *a-bhó-shta*, if *bhú*, "to be, to become," followed this aorist formation I cannot put faith* in a replacement of the secondary personal terminations, which belong to the aorists, by the primary, with the exchange of $\text{B } y$ and B (see § 255 *h*), and the removal of the 3d person into the 2d otherwise we should have to change the language in the case before us with three errors, while, according to my view of the Old Slavonic, it retains the merit of having preserved, in accordance with the oldest German dialect, the old middle The Gothic and Old Slavonic make up one another's deficiencies with regard to the middle, inasmuch as the former has preserved the present, the latter the preterites (the aorists and the imperfect) The fact that the Russian, in the 3d person singular and plural of the present, contrasts a B with the Old Slavonic $\text{B } y$, *e g*, $\text{HecemB } nes e-t$, $\text{HecyMB } nes-u-t$, for Old Slavonic $\text{HecETB } nes-e-ty$, $\text{HecyMB } nes-u-nty$, must be explained; in my opinion, thus, that the old *i* of the Sanscrit forms like *bár-a-ti*, *bán-a-nti*, which in Old Slavonic has been weakened to $\text{B } y$, has in Russian, as in several other modern languages, been entirely lost As, however, the Russian orthography requires that the imperceptible B be added to the final consonants, *i e* to those which are not followed by a perceptibly-sounding $\text{B } y$, the Russian forms, therefore, *nes-e-t* and *nes-u-t*, can, in the Russian character, be written no otherwise than HecemB , HecyMB .

* Cf. Schleicher, "Doctrine of Forms of the Church (or Kyrillian) Slavonic Language," p 337, where, in discussing the personal terminations here spoken of, the middle has been quite unnoticed

ALPHABETICAL TABLE OF CONTENTS

A heavier than *i* § 6

A *an*, privative § 537, of pronominal origin § 371

Ablative singular § 1,9 in Zend § 180 in Latin and Oscan § 181, in Greek § 183, in Gothic § 291 Rem 1 p 380, in Armenian p 172

G ed Note dual § 215 plural § 244

Ablaut see vowel increment, vowel weakening, vowel interchange

Accentuation § 785, p 1052

Accusative singular § 149 in Old Slavonic § 266, of the pronouns of the first and second person, and of the reflexive in German p 1113

Note ** *G* ed dual § 206, in Old Slavonic § 273 plural § 236, in

Old Slavonic § 275

Active § 426

Adjectives § 281 pronominal and derivative § 401 definite declension in Lithuanian and Old Slavonic §§ 283 285, in German § 287

Adverbs § 324 pronominal § 40, adverbial compounds § 290

Ampliatives § 290

Anusvara § 9 in Lithuanian § 10 in Old Slavonic § 783, Rem 1

Aorist § 542 in Latin § 546, in Old Slavonic § 261 and p 1490 *G* ed., Supplement 1) and 2)

Arian Languages affinity with the Slavonic and other European languages not traceable p 1215 Note

Aspiration thrown back in Sanscrit and Greek § 104

Atmanepadam § 426

Augment § 537, derivation from the demonstrative base *a* § 540

Auxiliary future § 648 in Old Slavonic, Supplement 4)

Aryayibhava p 145 *G* ed

Bahuvrīhi p 1432 *G* ed

ham, of Latin Imperfects from *am* § 5, 6

bo of Latin Futures from *fo* §§ 5 6, 662

Cases formation of § 112, division into strong, weak and middle cases §§ 129 130 difference of accentuation in strong and weak cases § 785 Rem p 1053

Causals § 739 in German § 740 in Old Slavonic § 741 in Lithuanian § 743, in Latin § 745 p 999 in Old Persian § 750, in Lashish § 750 p 1006 in Hindustāni § 877 Note †

Collective Compounds § 289

Comparative degree §§ 291, 307 in Latin § 299, in German § 301 in Old Slavonic § 302, in Lithuanian § 306

Compounds 1410 *G* ed

Conditional § 730

Conjugational classification § 109 21 § 493, Latin 1st, 2d and 4th conj.

- gations=Sanscrit 10th class § 109 ¹⁰⁶ p. 111, Latin 3d conjugation= Sanscrit 1st, 6th, and 4th class § 109 ¹⁰¹, §. 500, the German strong verbs=Sanscrit 1st class § 109 ¹⁰¹ p 105, or 4th class 109 ¹⁰², the German weak conjugation=Sanscrit 10th class §. 109 ¹⁰⁶, Armenian conjugations p 1271 G ed
- Conjunctions p 1459 G ed
- Conjunctive in Sanscrit, Zend, and Greek § 713, in Latin §§ 671, 690, of the imperfect § 707., of the perfect § 710 and p 1228 G ed, of the pluperfect §. 858 and p 1229, G ed, German conjunctive, preterite § 756, present § 694., Lithuanian conjunctive §. 681, Hindüstānī p 1276 G ed Note
- Consonants, permutation of § 87
- Copulative compounds (*dvandva*) p 1427 G ed
- Dative Singular, in Sanscrit and Zend § 161, in Lithuanian § 177, in Old Slavonic § 267., in Latin p. 1227 G. ed Note †, in German § 356 Rem 3, in Greek §. 195, dual §. 215, in Lithuanian § 215 p 231, in Old Slavonic §. 273, in Greek §§ 215, 221., plural § 211, in Lithuanian § 215, in Old Slavonic § 276, in Greek § 251.
- Degrees of comparison § 291
- Demonstratives § 343.
- Denominatives § 761.
- Dependent compounds (*tatpuruṣa*) p 1416 G ed
- Deponent of intensives § 760
- Derivative verbs § 732
- Desideratives § 751
- Determinative compounds (*kar madhūrayu*) p 1113 G ed
- Dual, its cases § 206
- Dvandva* p 1427 G ed
- Dvigu* p 1449 G ed.
- ē, in Sanscrit, Old High German, and Latin, from *ai* §§ 2., 5., 78, 688, in Greek (η), Gothic, Latin, from *ā* §§ 1, 69, 137 p 1115 G ed, in Latin and Gothic, through reduplication §§. 517, 605, p 827
- Feminine, character of § 118
- Final consonants suppressed in Slavonic § 255.¹
- Fruit, names of §§ 920, 921
- Future §§. 646, 692, in Old Slavonic, Supplement 4), in Hindüstānī p 1276 G ed Note
- Futurum exactum p. 1228 G ed, in Umbrian and Oscan p 1232 G. ed
- Genitive singular § 184, § 254 Rem 3, in Old Slavonic § 269; dual § 225, in Zend § 254 Rem 1, in Old Slavonic § 273.; plural § 245, in Old Slavonic § 278, §. 284 Note 6, § 783. Note *, p. 1046
- Gerunds, in Latin §. 809, in Sanscrit, in *tvā* p 1203 G ed Note *, p 1240 G. ed, in *ya*, p 1296 G ed, in Marāṭhī p 1215 G ed, in Prākṛit p 1215 G ed, p 1277 G. ed Note
- Guna, in Sanscrit § 26, in Greek § 26 p 24, § 491, in Gothic § 27, in Zend § 28, in Lithuanian § 744 p 997, in Old Slavonic § 255. ¹⁰⁷, § 741, Heavy personal terminations, influence of § 480.

- lightest of the primary vowels § 6
 Imperative § 717, of the aorist § 727 of the future § 9, Old Slavonic, imperative §§ 677 696 Carniolan § 697, Lithuanian §§ 681, 695, Old Prussian § 695, Lettish § 680
 Imperfect § 517
 Indeclinabilia p 14 3 G ed
 Infinitive Sanscrit, in *tum*, p 1007 G ed, in causal or dative relation p 1009 G ed, represented by forms in *āya anāya anē* pp 1 11—1011 G ed, by forms in *am*, p 1014 G ed, in *am, ayām* § 619 p 1015 G ed, in *tu* at the beginning of compounds (§ 853) p 1017 G ed, Vedic, in *tavē tavae*, p 1018 G ed, in *dhy* : p 1018 G ed in *shyā* p 1 21 G ed, in *ś*, p 1 G ed in *asē*, p 1 01 G ed, in *ē* p 1 05 C ed, in *am* p 1033 G ed in *tos* p 1038 G ed with an apparent passive meaning p 1 08 G ed periphrasis of passive infinitive p 1061 G ed Marathi, pp 1 15, 1 17 G ed, Osetish p 1 69 G ed, Armenian p 1 69 G ed Hindustani p 1 3 G ed, Zend § 610 Old Persian p 1158 G ed Latin p 1003 G ed, of the perfect p 1 0, G ed of the future p 103 G ed, of the passive participle p 1006 G ed Oscan and Umbrian p 1034 C ed Old Prussian p 1048 G ed, Lithuanian and Lettish, p 1050 C ed, Old Slavonic, p 1 51 G ed, German pp 1063 1 71 1010 1086 G ed Greek p 1 96 G ed, middle and passive p 1 9 G ed
 Insertion of euphonic sibilant §§ 9 96 of a labial § 96 of a nasal §§ 158 010, 034 046, in Old High German Old Saxon, and Anglo Saxon § 046, of a euphonic *y* § 47
 Instrumental singular in Sanscrit and Zend § 159 in the Veda dialect, p 1097 G ed, in Gothic § 109 * in Old High German § 160 in Lithuanian § 160 p 180 in Old Slavonic § 066 dual § 015 in Old Slavonic § 013, plural § 16, 043 in Old Slavonic § 077
 Intensive § 753
 Interrogative § 386
Karmadharmaja p 1443 G ed
L, for other liquids and semi vowels §§ 0, 409 p 071 Note †
 Letters 0 1 sonant § 5
 Light personal terminations § 480
Lit=Greek Conjunctive § 713
 Locative singular § 190 in Old Slavonic § 063 dual § 005 in Zenl § 53 Rem 1 p 076 plural § 50 in Old Slavonic § 79
M from *v* or *b* § 63, § 1000 1 p 111
 Middle terminations § 466, origin of §§ 470 473, reflexive § 4 6, in Gothic § 4 6 in Old Slavonic, p 1493 G ed, Supplement

* What is said in §§ 160 161 171 regarding the Gothic dative must be corrected according to § 356 Rem. 3 and so too the dative plural in *m* is not to be compared with the instrumental termination in *bhis* but with the real dative termination in *bhyas*

- Moods, formation of § 672
 Neuter § 113.
 Nominative singular § 134, of the bases in *n* § 139., of the bases in *ar*, *ra* (ऋ) § 144, of neuters § 148, in Old Slavonic §. 266., dual § 206, in Old Slavonic §. 274, plural §§. 226., 274.
 Numerals § 308
 Numeral adverbs § 321
ś in Sanscrit and Zend from *a + u* §§ 2, 33, Greek *u*, Gothic and Latin *ō*, from *ā* §§ 4, 69., p 1481 G ed
 Optative § 672
 Ordinal numbers § 321
Parasmātpadam § 426
 Participles § 779., future § 781., perfect § 786., middle and passive § 791., perfect passive §§ 820, 836
 Passive § 733
 Perfect §. 588
 Personal terminations § 134, middle and passive § 166, weight of § 180
 Pluperfect § 611
 Possessives § 404
 Possessive compounds (*bahuvrīhi*) p. 1132 G ed.
 Potential § 672
 Prepositions p. 1465 G ed
 Present § 507
 Preterite § 513
 Precativē §§ 701, 705
 Primary forms of nouns §§ 112, 116.
 Pronouns § 326, derivative pronominal adjectives §. 101
 Pronominal adverbs § 420
Ri (ठ) from *ar*, *ār*, *ra*, *ri*, *ru* §§. 1, 811, and p 1057 Note (*prachhāmī*) 109 b)2, *trītiya* § 322 *
R from *v* §§ 20, 409, Note 1, § 447, Table, Note 6
 Reduplication § 109 a)3, §§ 546, 679, 589, 751, 753
 Relative §§ 382, 383
 Roots § 106
 Radical words, p 1329 G ed
S, changes of §§ 21, 22, 86 5, 136, 302, p 1059, p 1374 G ed Note rejected § 128.
 Sound, system of §. 1, Old Slavonic §§ 255, 783, Rem 1, Mutation of, *vide* Consonants
 Special Tenses § 109 1
 Strong cases § 129
 Suffixes, Sanscrit *a*, pp 1235, 1338 G ed, Greek *o*, p 1235 G ed, Latin *u*, p 1236 G. ed, Lithuanian *a*, pp 1236, 1343 G ed, Old Slavonic *o*, p 1236 G ed, German *a*, pp 1237, 1238; Sanscrit *a* § 913, pp 1339, 1345 G ed, Greek *o*, pp 1339, 1346 G. ed, *ad*, p 1340 G ed, Lithua-

* *ri* from *ru*, in *śrinōmi*, "I hear," for *śrinōmi*, root *sru*

- man *a* p 1343 G ed Latin *u*, p 1340 G ed, *d* p 1341 G ed Gothic *a* p 134^o G ed Sanscrit **a* p 1346 G ed, Greek **a* p 1347 G ed, Latin **u* p 1317 G ed, Zend *a* **a* pp 1348 1349 G ed
- Sanscrit *a* Greek *a* *η* Latin *a*, Lithuanian *a*, Old Slavonic *a* Gothic *ō* nominative *a* *ōn*, nominative *o* p 1319 G ed
- Sanscrit *z*, Zend *z*, Gothic *z* Old Slavonic *z* nominative *z* *y*, Greek *z* *zδ*, *er* Latin *z* Lithuanian *z* § 974
- Sanscrit *u* Greek *υ* Lithuanian *u*, Gothic *u*, Zend *u* § 95
- Sanscrit *an* *ān*, Greek *av* *ev*, *ov* *ov* § 906
- Latin *on*, nom *ō* in nom *en* Gothic *an*, nom *a* Old High German *on* nom *o* § 907 Lithuanian *en*, nom *u*, p 1363 G ed, Sanscrit *an* neut, Gothic *an*, nom *o* § 98
- Sanscrit *in* § 99 Sanscrit **in* Greek **ω*, Latin **or* Sanscrit **in* § 930
- Sanscrit *ana*, fem *ana* *ani*, Zend *ana*, Greek *avo*, Lithuanian *āna*, Gothic **ana*, nom *an* *s*, *anon* nom *and* § 93
- Sanscrit *anya* §§ 904, 906, 907 Zend *nya* Gothic *nya* Lithuanian *nya*, *inya* § 906
- Sanscrit *āna* § 791
- Sanscrit *as* § 933 Greek *es* (nom *os* *ης* *es*), **es* Zend **as* Latin *us* *eris* *us* *or* *is* *ur*, *or* *ur* *is* *or* *or* *is* **or* *or* *is* §§ 934 937, 938 Gothic *isa* neut (nom and acc *is*) *is* *tra* *is* *la* *s* *la* *as* *su* (*drahtin* *as* *su* *s*) § 935, Old High German *us* *ta*, *us* *ti*, *os* *ta*, *os* *ti* Lithuanian *as* *ti* § 936
- Sanscrit *us*, p 138^o G ed
- Sanscrit *is* p 1382 G ed
- Sanscrit *ya* § 889 Latin *in* neuter § 890 Sanscrit **yan* neut Gothic **ya* Latin **iu* Greek **i* § 891, Old Slavonic **iue* *ye* § 89^o Lithuanian **ya* § 893 Sanscrit *yā* Gothic *yo* nom *ya* *or* *i* § 894 Old Slavonic *ya* Lithuanian *ia* *e* § 895 Latin *ia* *iē* *ion* **ia* **iē* **ion* Greek *a* § 896 Old High German **i* § 897 New High German **e* § 898 Sanscrit **yā* Greek **a* Old High German **ya* neut nom *i* Gothic **em* nom *ei* § 899 Sanscrit *ya* fut pass part Zend *ya* Gothic *ya* Lithuanian *ia* nom *is* Latin *iu* Greek **i* §§ 899 900, Sanscrit **ya* Zend **ya* Greek **io* **a* Latin **ui* **ia* §§ 891, 90^o Latin *ia* for Sanscrit *i* Greek *iδ* (?) § 90^o Gothic **ya* fem **yo* **yan* *yan*, Sanscrit *ya*, Zend *ya*, Lithuanian *ia*, fem *e* Old Slavonic *yo* § 903
- Sanscrit *yu* Zend *yu* Lithuanian *iu* Greek *ev* p 1390 G ed
- Sanscrit **yans* *iyas* see Comparative
- Sanscrit **iyā* see Possessives
- Sanscrit **ēya*, Greek **io* **i* Latin **eyu*, **eu* § 98
- Sanscrit *ra* *la*, *a* *la* *i* *la* *u* *la* *i* *ra* *u* *ra* *e* *ra* *o* *ra* § 939 Zend *ra* § 940 Greek *po* *λ* Latin *ru* *la*, Gothic *ra* *la* Old High German *a* *la*, *u* *la* *i* *la*, *e* *la* nom *a* *l* &c § 940, Lithuanian *a* *la* Greek *a* *λo*, *λo* *v* *p* *v* *λo* *a* *po* *po* Latin *u* *lu*, *u* *la*, *e* *ru* *i* *li* (?) § 941

The mark () prefixed distinguishes the secondary suffixes from the primary

Sanscrit **ra*, **la*, **i-ra*, **i-la*, **i-ra*, **i-la*, Zend **ra*, Greek **po*, **lo*, Latin *li* (?) § 912

Sanscrit **i*, Greek *pi*, Latin **i*, *e-i* § 913

Sanscrit **ru*, Lithuanian **ru* § 911

Sanscrit **ra*, Latin **ru*, **ru* §§ 915, 946

Sanscrit **van*, Zend **van* § 917

Sanscrit **vant*, **vat*, Zend **vant*, **at*, Latin **antu*, Gothic **lauda* §§. 109, 410, Lithuanian **leta*, **huta*, **la*, **ant* ; 111, Sanscrit **iant*, **rat*, Latin **lent*, **lentu*, Greek *evr* § 959

Sanscrit **vas*, **zāns*, **rat*, **nsh*, fem *ushī* § 786, Lithuanian *cu* (nom *cu*-*), *usia*, nom f *usi*, Old Prussian *wun-s*, *un-s*, *on-s*, *an-s* (nom m *un*) Zend **vāonh*, **ush*, **úsh*, fem *ushī*, **úshī* §§ 786, 787, Gothic **usia* (nom pl m *bērusiōs*, "the parents," as "having begotten") 788, Greek *or*, **via*, Latin **uri* (*sec-ur*-s), **osu*-s § 789, Old Slavonic **v'sh*, fem *v'shi* (after vowels) § 790

Sanscrit **na*, Zend **na*, Gothic **na*, Lithuanian **na*, Old Slavonic **no*, Greek **vo*, Latin **nu* §§ 836, 837, 838 ; Sanscrit **na*, fem *nā*, Zend **na*, Greek **vo*, **ny*, Latin **nu*, **na*, Old High German **na*, f *nō*, nom *n'*, **na* § 812

Sanscrit **i-na*, Greek **i-ro*, Gothic **ei-na*, Old High German **i-na*, Lithuanian **i-na*, **i-na*, **y-na* (= *i-na*), **o-na*, Old Slavonic **E-no* § 838, Latin **i-nu*, **i-na*, **e-nu*, **e-na*, **á nu*, **nu* § 839 ; Sanscrit **i-na* § 839 p 1185 G ed

Sanscrit **ānī*, f (*indriā nī*, **mātulā nī*, &c), Greek **ava*, **ω-ny* Latin **ō na*, **ō-na*, Lithuanian **ē-nē*, Old Slavonic **hnyā* *gnyā*, Old High German **inna*, New High German *in*, *inn*, Old Northern **gnyā* §§ 840, 841.

Sanscrit **ni*, f, Greek **ni*, Old Slavonic **ni*, nom *ni* *ny*, Lithuanian **ni*, Gothic **ni* § 813

Sanscrit **ni* m, Latin **ni*, Old Slavonic **ni*, Lithuanian **ni* f 850

Sanscrit **nu*, s-*nu*, Zend **nu*, Lithuanian **nu*, s *nu*, Gothic **nu*, Latin **nu* fourth declension, Greek **vv* §§ 918, 919

Sanscrit **nt*, **ant*, **t*, **at*, see Participle present and future

Sanscrit **ma*, Zend **ma*, Greek **mo*, Latin **mu*, Lithuanian **i-ma*, **mma*, Gothic **ma*, Old High German **ma* §§ 808, 809 ; Greek **my*, Latin **ma*, Lithuanian **ma*, **mē* § 810, Gothic **mō* § 950

Sanscrit **mi*, Gothic **mi* § 950

Sanscrit **man*, **mān*, **i-man*, **i mán*, Zend **man* §§ 796, 797, Greek **mon*, **μον*, **μεν*, Latin **mōn*, **min*, **mōn* *ia* §. 797, Greek **mīn* § 798, Gothic **man*, Old High German **mon*, Lithuanian **men*, nom *mē*, Old Slavonic **men*, nom. MBI **my* §§. 799, 800, Greek **mat*, Latin **men*, **min*, Old Slavonic **men* neut.; Sanscrit **i-man*, Old High German **mon* § 799 conclusion

Latin **mentu*, Greek **μνθ*, **μνγγ*, Old High German **munda*, nom *mund* § 803

Sanscrit **māna*, Old Prussian **mana*, Lithuanian **ma*, Greek **μενο*, Latin **minu*, **minu*, Gothic **monyō*, f, Old Slavonic **mo*, Zend **mana*, **mna*, **mn* § 791—795.

Latin **mulu* § 808

Sanscrit *mara* *vava* § 809

Sanscrit **want* *mut* § 959

Sanscrit *ha* *a ha* *ā ha*, *i ha* *u ha*, *ā ha*, Latin *h* *cu* *i cu*, *i cu*, *i-c*, *ā c*, *ō c*
Greek *α κ* *α κ*, *ι κ* *αι κ* (*γιναικ*) from *αικ*, Lithuanian *i ha* *i kha*
Gothic *aga* § 901, Old High German *i nga* nom *ing* *u ngā* f, nom
unga (f) § 902 Sanscrit **ha* §§ 401 953 Gothic **ha* **ja*, **i-g*
§ 903 Latin **cu* Greek **κ*, **i κ*, *τ κ* § 905, Gothic Lithuanian,
Old Prussian **i sha* Old Slavonic *i sha* Greek *ι-σ κ* *ι-σ κ η* § 951

Sanscrit *t* Latin *t* Greek *τ* §§ 909 conclusion 910

Sanscrit *ta* Zend *ta* Lithuanian *ta* Latin *tu*, Greek *τ* §§ 800 801, 801,
824, Gothic *ta* *da* § 803 Latin *du* § 802, Old Slavonic *to* *lo*
§§ 875 806 Marathi *lā*, fem *lī* neut *lo* p 1160 G ed (cf Bengali
p 1159 G ed)

Sanscrit **i ta* Latin **tu*, Greek **ro*, Lithuanian **ta* Old Slavonic **to*
sto §§ 827 808

Sanscrit **ta*, **tat* **tati* Greek *τη* Latin *ta* *t it* *tāt* Gothic *thō* nom
tha once *do da* (p 1169 G ed) Old High German *di* nom *du*,
English *th* Old Slavonic *ta* § 829-834

Sanscrit *ti*, f Zend *tī* Gothic *ti* *tī* *di* Lithuanian *ti* Old Slavonic *ti*
§§ 844 867 Greek *τι* *σι* *σ ι α* §§ 845, 846 Lithuanian *tē* from *tia*,
**y ste* from *y stia*, Old Slavonic **sti* § 41, Latin *ti* *ti* *ti* *ti* *ti* *ti*
ti p 1195 G ed

Sanscrit *ti* m Lithuanian *ti* Gothic *ti* *di* Lithuanian *ti* *chia* (caphonic
for *tia*) Old Slavonic *ti* Greek *τι* Latin *ti* **sti* (f) § 848

*Sanscrit *a ti* Greek *ε τι* Lithuanian *a schia* nom *a stis* § 849

Sanscrit **ti*, Zend *tī* Latin *t* § 414

Sanscrit *tīya*, Zend *tīya* Gothic *dyan* Latin *tiu* Slavonic *tīyo*, nom *tī*
Lithuanian *tīyo* from *tia* §§ 300 323

Sanscrit *tu* f (see Infinitive) Greek *τ*, p 143 G ed Zend *tu*, p 1014
G ed Latin *tu* *tu*, 4th declension m § 865, **a tu* p 1403 G ed Old
Prussian *tu* (infin) Lithuanian *tu* (supine) Old Slavonic *тѣ* *t* (su-
pine) §§ 866 868 Gothic *tu*, *thū* *du* m § 956, Sanscrit *a thu* m
§ 956 conclusion

Sanscrit *tu*, m, Gothic *tu*, *du* Greek *τ* § 907

Sanscrit *tār* *tri* Zend *tār*, Greek *τη* *τ* *τη* *τ* Latin *t* *τ*, *turu* Slavonic
tely §§ 646, 647 810 811, 814 815 Sanscrit fem *tri*, Latin *tric*
Greek *τρις* *τρια* *τριά*, *τς* §§ 119, 811, Latin **a ter* *i tōr* Greek
**τη* *ς* **δη* *ς* **ι δη* § 957

Sanscrit *tar* *tr* *tri* Zend *tar* *thr* Greek *τη* *τ* Latin *ter* *tr*, Gothic
tar *tr* *thar* *thr*, Lithuanian *ter*, nom *te*, Old Slavonic *ter* nom *ti*
§§ 144 (p 157) 26 810

Sanscrit *tra* fem *tra*, Greek *τρο*, *τρα* *θο* *θ* Latin *tru*, *tra* Zend *tra*
thra §§ 816, 817, Gothic *tra* *thra* *dra* Old High German *tra*, *dra*,
nom and acc *tar* *dar* New High German *ter* English *ter* § 818
Gothic *thlo*, f, nom *thla* Old High German nom *dla* *dila*, *dela* *dal*,
Greek *τλ* *τλη* *θλο*, *θλη* Gothic *thro* nom *thra*, Old High German
trō nom *tra* *tar* *tera* *ter* § 819

Sanskrit **trā*, Zend **thra* § 420

• Sanskrit **trā*, Gothic **drē* § 991

Sanskrit *-tana*, Zend **tura*, Greek **τερο*, Latin *-teru*, Gothic **thana*, Old High German **dana* § 291, Old Slavonic **toro*, **tero* § 297

Sanskrit **tama*, Zend **tīma*, Latin **timu*, **simu*, Gothic **tuman*, *tum'-ista*, *dum'-ista* §§ 291, 292, 295

Sanskrit **tas*, Latin **tus*, Greek **θευ*, Old Slavonic *dū*, § 293 (p 379), 421

Sanskrit **tana*, Latin *tinu* §§ 960, 961

Sanskrit **tavya*, Latin *tīvu*, Greek *τεο* § 904, Lithuanian *toya*, Old Slavonic *a-tayo*, nom *a-tai* § 905

Sanskrit **tya*, Gothic **thya*, Latin **tu*, Greek *σιο* § 961

Sanskrit *tva*, Zend *𐬔𐬀𐬭𐬀* *thwa*, Gothic *tva*, neut nom *tv*, *thwō*, fem nom *thwa*, Old High German *don*, nom *do*, Old Slavonic *ta*, *ba*, Lithuanian *ba*, *bē* (?) §§ 835, 864, and p 1244 G ed

Sanskrit **tva*, Old Slavonic **stvo* § 834

Sanskrit **tvano*, Prakrit *ttana*, Old Persian *tana*, Greek fem **συνη*, adj **συνο*, Lithuanian adj *tina*, adv *tinay* pp 1216, 1457 G ed

Sanskrit **tha*, Greek *το*, Latin *tu*, Lithuanian *ta*, Slavonic *to*, Gothic *tan*, *dan*, nom *ta*, *da* §§ 322, 323, Sanskrit *-tham*, Latin **tem* § 425

Sanskrit **thā*, Zend *tha*, Latin *ta*, *tī* § 425 and p 1227 G ed, Note .

Sanskrit **dā*, Slavonic *da*, *g da*, Lithuanian *da* § 422

Sanskrit **dhā*, Greek **χα*, § 325

Sanskrit **śas*, Greek *κis* § 324

Sanskrit **sya*, Latin **ru* (?) § 962, Gothic *arya*, **arya* § 963

Sanskrit **ha*, Zend *dha*, Greek *θα*, Gothic *th*, *d* § 420

Superlative §§ 291, 298

Supine in Latin, pp 1245, 1253 G ed, in Lithuanian and Lettish, p. 1247 G ed, in Old Slavonic, p 1252 G ed

Tadhita suffixes, p 1335 G ed.

Tenses, formation of § 507

T-sound suppressed at the end of a word in Greek §§ 155, 456, in German §§ 294 Rem 1 p 385, 432.

U, middle vowel weight §§ 490, 584

Umlaut § 72

Verb § 426

Vowel weakening §§ 6, 109 w¹, 272, 490, 605

Vowel strengthening, *See* Guna

Vowel interchange, in German §§ 68, 589, pp 1335, 1338 G ed, in Old Slavonic § 255, p 1237 G ed, in Lithuanian § 744, pp 1236 G ed, Note, 1336, 1341, in Greek § 589, in Latin p. 1336 G ed

Visarga § 11

Vocative singular § 204, in Old Slavonic § 272; dual § 206, in Old Slavonic § 273; plural § 226, in Old Slavonic § 280 Table

Vriddhi §§ 26, 27, p 1335 G ed

Weak cases § 129

Words, suffixes used in formation of, *Vide* Suffixes

CORRECTIONS AND ADDITIONS

- § 2 Regarding *ē* from *ai* see § 688 p 917
- § 3 Regarding *ε* and *o* see al o p 13 5 G ed Note †
- § 3 l 19 Read *ai*, *ei*, or *oi*
- § 6 Regarding *r'iponis* from *ri'iponyas* see p 131 G ed Note
- § 7 Regarding the weight of the *u* see §§ 490 524
- § 15 l 16 for *never* read *seldom*
- § 9 Mention should have been made here of the Cretan *τρε*, "three, from *τF* = Sanscrit *tā*
- § 96 Regarding Greek *oi* as Guna of *i* see § 191 regarding Guna in Old Slavonic and Lithuanian see § 55 b 9, 41 716
- § 3 What is here said respecting *ḷ* *o* is to be corrected according to § 447 Note
- § 33 *ḷ* according to Burnouf, occurs occasionally as the termination of the genitive singular of the *u* bases for the more common *ḷcuc*, *e g*, *ḷḷḷḷḷḷ* *bu'-ābs*, "brachii
- § 35 p 3 The Zend *dātā* in *kha dātā*, belongs to the Sanscrit root *dha* 'to place, to make, not to *da*, to give see § 637
- § 40 Last two but one for *ḷḷḷḷḷḷ* *huf'dhris* read *ḷḷḷḷḷḷ* *huf'dhris*
- § 41 p 37 l 19 for *ḷḷḷḷḷḷḷḷ* *āhūrya* read *ḷḷḷḷḷḷḷḷ* *nūhūrya*
- § 4 To be completed according to p 963 Note
- § 4 p 39 l 7 for *ḷḷ y* read *ḷḷḷ ya*
- § 4 p 40 l 4 5 to be corrected according to § 701
- § 44 l 14 for *ḷḷḷḷḷḷḷ* *āthartan* read *ḷḷḷḷḷḷḷ* *atarvan*
- § 45 l 17 for *ḷḷḷḷḷḷḷ* *dadhuao* read *ḷḷḷḷḷḷḷ* *dadhuāo* The root corresponds to the Sanscrit *dha* see § 637
- § 45 p 4 l 0 for *ḷḷḷ* *abi* read *ḷḷḷḷ* *abi*
- § 45 p 4 l 96 for *ḷḷḷḷḷ* *aov* read, according to Burnouf *avi* (*e* "over) and *yasno* signifies 'reverence
- § 46 l 1 for *ḷḷḷḷḷḷḷ* *iturunē* read *ḷḷḷḷḷḷḷ* *ataurun*
- § 46 l 13 for *ḷḷḷḷ* *taruna* read *ḷḷḷḷ* *tirun a*
- § 48 l 5 for *ḷḷḷḷḷḷ* *hērepēm* read *ḷḷḷḷḷḷ* *hērepēm* *! . p m*

I take this opportunity of cancelling *wl* as is said at p 11 5 Note Had I remembered the Note at § 447 I should not have written my note or changed the *ḷ* in several places into *ḷ* which latter letter is reserved it seems for the final syllable — *Trai slator*

§ 49 p 45 l 1 omit *th*

§ 49 p 45 l 6 7 for *අස්තං* *asthanm* read *අස්තං* *astanm*

§ 61 last line The termination *ann* from *án* belongs to the potential, precative, and subjunctive

§ 65 l 20 Also between *a* and *r* (*hazanra*, "thousand")

§ 77 l 2 Regarding the Zend *o* see § 447. Note

§ 90 p 78 It is better to regard the phenomenon here discussed, so as to assume *d* in Gothic to be the proper character of the 3d person, and the Old High German *t* as the regular substitute for it. The *d* has maintained itself also in the Gothic passive (*bair-a-da*), and the active form *bairith* is to be deduced from *bairid*, as the Gothic prefers aspirates to medials at the end of a word. The same is the case with the passive participle, the suffix of which in Gothic is *da*, which in Old High German, in consequence of the second phonetic change, becomes *ta*, so that, by proceeding in the corruption, we recur to the original form

§ 90 l 16 *da* is an abbreviation of *dai*=Greek *ται*, Sanscrit *tē*, see § 466

§ 95 last line, is to be corrected according to § 616 2d Note. The *s* of *tars-t*, *tors-ta*, belongs to the root

§ 99 p 88 l 4 add *ED*

§ 100 p 90 l 4 Regarding *sēdi*, *vīdi*, from *sesedi*, *vividi*, see § 547

§ 100. p 90 cf §§ 547, 576, 579

§ 102, concl, cf Slavonic and Lithuanian § 457

§ 109 a 1) l 8 The accent distinguishes here the 1st class from the 6th, since, *e g*, for *pātati* we should have, did it belong to the 6th class, *patāti*.

§ 109 a 3) p 107 l 23 To the 2d class belong also *FLA*, *FA*, and *NA*

§ 109 a 4) l 11 I now consider the *v* of *sarhva*, and similar verbs, as purely euphonic, cf § 86, and Latin forms like *coquo*, *linguo*, *stinguo*

§ 109 b 1) p 113, l 6 for § 117 2 read p 107.

§ 109 b 2) p 117, l 24 for *කේරිඤ්ඤ* *kēriññi* read *කේරිඤ්ඤ* *kēreññi*

§ 109 b 2) p 118, l 20 To be corrected according to p 1320, G ed Note

§ 112 p 125, l 15 for *kimah* read *kimah*

§ 116 l 25 To be corrected according to p 1334 G ed

§ 119 p 130, l 26 for *අරිඤ්ඤ* *aridññi* read *අරිඤ්ඤ* *aridññi*

§ 125 last line but one, for "in the oblique cases" read "in most of the oblique cases"

§ 135 Respecting the nominative singular of Gothic bases in *ya* see p 1309 G ed Remark

§ 139 p 151, l 19 I now prefer taking the *v* of *hominis*, &c, as the weakening of the *o* of *homo*. The relation resembles that of Gothic forms like *ahmun-is*, *ahmun*, to the nominative and accusative *ahma*, *ahman*, which preserve the original vowel

§ 141 p 153 l 9 for *namón-a* read *namn-a* (p 1083 Note)

§ 144 p 157, l 10 for *ටොප* read *ටොප*, and at l 14 *ටොප* for *ටොප* (as termination of the base)

§ 148 p 163, l 2 for *චාචා* *vachā* read *චාචා* *vachā*

- § 16 last line but one The *a* of *ā dēm* is the preposition corresponding to the Sanscrit *a*
- § 157 2d Note Latter part to be corrected according to § 386 p 544
- § 157 Table p 174 1 1 for *patin* read *pātin*
- § 160 The German dative singular is according to § 36 Rem 3., to be every where identified with the Sanscrit dative and so too the dative plural, the *m* of which approaches as closely to the Sanscrit *bhyas* Latin *bus* Lithuanian *mus* as the instrumental termination *bhis* Lithuanian *mis*
- § 163 1 4 for *vrikē n a* read *vrikē n a*, with *n* through the enphonic influence of the *r*
- § 164 p 182 1 2 To be corrected according to § 254 p 86 Note †
- § 171 and § 172 p 190 1 2 To be corrected according to § 356 Rem 3 p 501 last line but seven
- § 178 p 194, 1 2 for *tanāv ē* read *tanav ē*
- § 180 p 196, 1 18 for *ṛṇṇas* read *ṛṇṇas* (see § 447 p 624 Note) for *ṛṇṇas aot* occurs also *ṛṇṇas eut e a ṛṇṇas, mainyut* from *mainyu*
- § 183 cf the Gothic ablatives in *o* adduced in § 294 Rem 1 p 384
- § 191 p 210 1 14 Gothic *handau s* 1 20 for *fiyand s* read *fiyand is* see § 234 p 30 Note †
- § 194 p 210, 1 22 for *namn o* read *namn as* 1 3 24 for *brāt ar s* probably should be read *brāthr o* after the analogy of *dāthr o creatoris* (Birnouf 'Yaçna' p 363 Note) The genitive of *dughdar* is probably *dughdēr o* (see p 194 Note †)
- § 195 and § 203 I now refer the Latin dative to the Sanscrit dative, rather than to the locative see p 1 27 Ged Note
- § 214 p 223 Note last line but one expunge the words *and which is* entirely wanting in the genitive
- § 216 1 3 also *as bis*
- § 2 1 10 for *अस्माभ्यम् asma bhyam*, *युष्माभ्यम् yusmabhyam*, read *अस्मभ्यम् asmabhyam* *युष्मभ्यम् yusmabhyam*
- § 226 p 43 1 3 As to the Latin termination *ē s* see § 797 p 1078 *passim*
- § 235 1 5 *Zend tēhrhaonho* see § 299 and as to *hoste s messē s bovē s vocē s ferente s sermonē s fratēr s matrē s dator ē s* see p 108
- § 236 1 9 The Old Prussian too exhibits in the accusative plural *ns e g taita ns nar pas* Respecting the Vedic termination *nr*, from *rs* see § 517 Remark
- § 236 first Note for *vidians* read *vidiāns*
- § 39 1 3 cf Vedic forms in *an*
- § 24 first line of Table for *vulfan s* read *vulfa ns*
- twelfth line of Table Lithuanian *sund s*, Gothic *sunu ns*
- p 60 1 5 Gothic *fiyand s*
- § 243 1 5 As to the German dative see correction at § 160
- Table, last line but one for *nama m* read *namn am*

- § 248 l 1 of Old Prussian *-son, e g*, in *ster-son*, τὼν
- § 249 fifth line of Table, for *ti-i-n-ām* read *ti-ay-ā-nām*, from the extended base *traya*
- § 254 p 274, l 12 Lithuanian *willkū*
l 17 *willkūs* for *willkū*.
- Rem 3, p 281, l 11 As to *αυεσθης zanthwā*, see p 1241 G ed
- p 287, l 9 Regarding *hur-ē-s* and similar forms see p 1078
- p 305, l 6 for *brātai-s* read *brāthi-ō*, according to the correction at § 194 p 210, l 23
- § 255 b) p 311, l 15 The suppression here noticed of final *i* refers to Dobrowsky's incorrect orthography In point of fact, however, the final *i* in Old Slavonic has either been retained unaltered, or has become *y, e g*, that which Dobrowsky, l e, writes *dadjat*, "they give," *sāt*, "they are," should be corrected to *ДѢДѢТЬ dadanty*, *СѦТЬ sunty* Regarding the nasalized vowels, see § 783 Remark
- § 255 c) Here, according to § 783 Remark, we must distinguish between *oy ū* and *ŕ un*
- p 318, l 13 for *पिन्दरा pāndara* read *पिन्दरा pāndara*
e) p 319 of § 783 Remark
b) p 323, cf § 783 Remark
c) p 324 The vowels mentioned here, preceded by *y*, are, with the exception of *ye* and *yī*, nasalized vowels (see § 783 Remark), and hence, *pyaty*, "five," must be pronounced *panty* (in the original character ПѦТЬ)
- § 259 p 329, l 15 To be corrected according to § 647, last Note
- § 266 cf § 783 b)
- last line but two, for *m* (according to Dobrowsky) we should read *mь my*
- § 280 Table In the instrumental, *my* is every where to be read for *m*
- § 294 Rem 2 Regarding *hi-dh ē* see § 991
- § 305 l 1 2 for "better" read "best"
- § 306 p 414 In the Lithuanian comparative adverbs like *daug aus*, "more," *mažaus*, "less," I regard the *u* as the vocalization of the *n*, thus, *daugiaus* from *daugians*, where *iaus*=Sanskrit *īyāus* of the strong cases
- § 315 l 2 read *ἐπτά* (in the accentuation=Vedic *aptā*)
- § 319 Rem p 440 J. Grimm, in his history of the German language, p 246, agrees with my explanation of *eif*, *zuwolf*, and analogous forms in Lithuanian and Slavonic
- p 441, Note † I now prefer, with Benfey, to assign the Latin *linquo*, Greek *λείπω*, Gothic *af-lif-na*, to the Sanskrit *nich*, from *nih*, "to leave"
- § 338 Regarding the Old Slavonic *nas*, *vas*, see § 783 first Note p 1046
- § 340 l 3, 4 of Table Respecting the *k* of the Gothic *mi-k*, *thu-k* (and that of *si-k*, "self") see § 814 p 1104, Note † In Old Slavonic we should read for *mya*, *tya*, according to § 785 Rem and 2), *man*, *tan*

- § 341 p 476, l 3 Respecting the origin of the Sanscrit *sra* see § 94^r
 § 343 p 478 l 16 *ṛ* with the semi vowel *ṛ*
 — p 479 l 6 Regarding *totus* see p 1313 G ed Note
 § 383 l 4 for *yus* read *yas*
 pp 539 540 l 8 As to the Gothic suffix *ba* and Lithuanian *p* cf p 146^o
 G ed Note l 19
 § 387 l 15 Regarding *quæ* as plural neuter see § 394
 § 416 Regarding *leiks*, see too p 144 G ed
 § 419 p 587 l 10 As to forms like *regthi-s* see also § 94 conclusion
 § 421 p 59^o, l 7 to be corrected according to p 12 G ed Note
 § 425 l 9 of the Zend *uti*, thus from the base *u* as to the Latin
uti see p 1^o G ed Note †
 § 436 p 609 l 17 and § 41^o p 118 Table l 3 and , for *g u* should be
 written *ā un* see § 783 Remark 4)
 § 435 p 615, l 14 For *da-dhi-rev-dazdi* and so perhaps *a-di-tischdi*
 for *a dhi-tischdhi* did the said forms actually occur as the Sanscrit *dhi*
 in Zend loses its aspirate after sibilants
 — p 636 12 Regarding *a-dhi* &c., see the preceding correction
 § 456 p 639 l 8 for § 433 read § 13
 § 458 p 640 l 20 for *i* read *u*
 § 460 To be corrected according to § 783
 § 463 Of the termination *ant* only the *t* has been dropped but the *n* is
 contained in the preceding nasalized vowel (see § 783 Remark) hence
 we should read *an* for *a un* for *g*
 § 464 p 646 Note Respecting *iacsayato* see § 922
 § 465 Table p 119 In the 3d person plural of the Old Slavonic for *uty*
aty we should read *unty anty* and for *a an* see § 783 Remark
 § 466 p 649, l 1^o cf § 173
 § 470 p 63 Note * cf § 71^o p 956 Note
 § 472 last line but three for special forms read secondary forms
 § 474 p 659 l 20 To be corrected according to § 883 p 129 G ed
 § 480 p 670 last line of Table for *sūty* read *suntty*
 § 485 first line of table, for *kr na nu* read *kri nā ni*
 § 490 In the German preterite, the weakening of the vowel is produced
 by the polysyllableness see § 490 Rem 1
 § 495 p 691 l 1 cf p 996
 § 496 first line of Table for *gyb nā* read *gyb nā ni*
 § 500 p 195, l 1^o for *bhūta-jāmi* read *bhūta-jāni*
 § 503 p 700 l 1 for *αε(ο) ας μενος* read *α (ουρ) ας μενος*
 § 504 p 701 From line 16 ' In this point to line 19 The Prakrit
 expunge
 § 505 l 1^o cf § 741 p 992
 § 506 Mielcke's 4th conjugation, too belongs to the Sanscrit 10th class
 see § 698 Note
 — p 704 l 4 for *srayāśhi* read *srayāśi*
 § 507 p 71^o for *veśu iēśuty* read *iēś u n iēś u nty* see § 783 4) and 5)
 §§ 50 53 The Lithuanian *barau* &c and *lurlau* are to be expunged

- § 531 l 8 for Kruger read Kuhner
- § 552 last line but three cf. p 1227, Note †
- §. 561. last line of Table, for *būd-i sha* read *būd-i-shan*
- § 569 p. 792, Note †, instead of *f* for *h* read *f* for *p*
- § 647 p 878, l 13 for τωρ read τωρ
p 879, l. 5. To be corrected according to § 818.
- § 664 first line of Table Zend forms of the 1st person singular, like the theoretically formed *būsyēm*, are not quoteable; cf § 731, Remark
- § 665 l 2 cf § 731 Remark
- § 668 l 12, 15 for *zws zan* read *zws zan*
l 9 19 30 for *zanhyamana* read *zanhyamana*, and from l 30 to end of §, expunge
- § 724 p 969, l. 8 for *ṣawjḥḥṣawj nā'emnāi* read *ṣawjḥḥṣawj nā'ēmnāi*
- § 741 p 993, l 21 According to Kuischat, *o* in Lithuanian is always long
- § 751 p 1008 cf § 776 pp. 1037, 1033
- § 770 p 1027, l 29 To be corrected according to § 537.
p 1030, l 19 for *ufar-haf-ya-n(a) s* read *ufar-haf-a-n(u)s*
- §. 785 p 1053, last line Note, for 1845 read 1813
p 1054, l 30 In compound words I now ascribe the throwing back of the accent in the vocative to the circumstance that compounds in Greek regularly throw back the accent as far as possible I therefore assume that the accent in vocatives like *Ἀγαμέμνων, εὐδαίμων*, rests on that syllable of the base word to which it originally belongs, and that, on the other hand, in *Ἀγαμέμνων, Ἀγαμέμνωνος, εὐδαίμων, εὐδαίμωνος*, it has sunk down from its original position on the base for well known reasons
- § 805 p 1089, Note *, for *muddu-mmas, muddis*, read *diddu-mmas, duddis*
- § 807 p 1091, l. 8 cf p 1178 G ed l 4
- § 809 p 1095, l 23 cf § 417 G, p 627.
- P. 1462 G ed l 16 *Ob*, and the conjunctions of equivalent meaning in other languages, appear also in the nominative relation in sentences like "*er ist ungewiss, ob er kommen wird, oder nicht*," "It is uncertain whether he will come or not" The Latin *utrum*, as neuter, is adapted, by its case termination, as well for the nominative as the accusative relation The signification "*if*," is, moreover, claimed by our *ob*, in combination with *schon, gleich*, and *wohl* (*obschon, obgleich, obwohl*)

LONDON

—

PRINTED BY W M WATTS CROWN-COURT TEMPLE BAR.